

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Library
of the
University of Wisconsin

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

BY

MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

VOL. V.

FOR

1838-40.

“ If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle ? ”

LONDON:

**PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL;
& J. H. PARKER, OXFORD.**

1840.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY GILBERT AND RIVINGTON,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

101905

DEC 18 1906

DL45

T67

5

CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

No. 83.

ADVENT SERMONS ON ANTICHRIST.

Feast of St. Peter, 1838

	PAGE
Sermon I. The Times of Antichrist	1
„ II. The Religion of Antichrist	15
„ III. The City of Antichrist.....	28
„ IV. The Persecution of Antichrist	41

No. 84.

WHETHER A CLERGYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BE NOW BOUND TO HAVE MORNING AND EVENING PRAYERS DAILY IN HIS PARISH CHURCH?

Feast of St. Bartholomew, 1838.

COLLECTIONS IN ORDER TO THE RESOLUTION OF THIS QUESTION.

PAGE	PAGE
Book of Common Prayer.... 1	Mr. Nicolas Farrer 19
Dr. Nicholls 4	Dr. Best..... 20
Bishop Overall 7	Bishop Taylor 21
Bishop Cosins 8	Dr. Hammond ib.
Anglo-Saxon Church ib.	Mr. Wheatly 22
Dr. Bisse 9	Dean Comber 25
Advice to readers of the Com-	Bishop Bull 31
mon Prayer 10	Bishop Stillingfleet 32
Bishop Taylor 13	Bishop Beveridge ib.
Bishop Fell..... ib.	Bishop Gibson 33
Mr. Nelson..... 14	Archbishop Secker ib.
Bishop Burnet ib.	Bishop Butler 34
Homily "of the right use of	Observations 35
the Church" 15	Table of Public Services in
Dr. Cave..... ib.	the beginning of the 18th
Mr. George Herbert..... 17	century 41

No. 85.

LECTURES ON THE SCRIPTURE PROOFS OF THE DOCTRINES
OF THE CHURCH.

PART I.

Feast of St. Matthew, 1838.

	PAGE
Lecture I. Difficulties in the Scripture proof of the Doctrines of the Church	1
„ II. The difficulties of Latitudinarianism	14
„ III. On the General Structure of the Bible as a record of Faith	27
„ IV. Mode in which Facts of History are contained in Scripture ..	35
„ V. The impression conveyed by the statement of Facts and Doctrines in Scripture	49
„ VI. External difficulties of the Canon and the Catholic Creed, compared	70
„ VII. Internal difficulties of the Canon and the Catholic Creed, compared	86
„ VIII. Difficulties of Jewish and Christian Faith, compared	102

No. 86.

INDICATIONS OF A SUPERINTENDING PROVIDENCE IN THE
PRESERVATION OF THE PRAYER BOOK AND IN THE
CHANGES WHICH IT HAS UNDERGONE.*Feast of the Annunciation, 1839.*

PART I.

EXPRESSIONS OF REPENTANCE INTRODUCED INTO OUR LITURGY.

1. Whether a Divine purpose be ascertainable.....	3
2. Such an enquiry particularly necessary at present	5
3. The three divisions of the argument.....	8
4. That we have given us the language of servants rather than sons.....	9
5. The Collects	10
6. Verbal alterations	14
7. Commencement of our Liturgy.....	16
8. The general tone and spirit of our Prayer Book....	19

	PAGE
9. The Sunday Lessons	23
10. Changes in the Rubric	24
11. Omission of anointing at Baptism and Confirmation.....	27
12. Changes in the Visitation of the Sick	29
13. Concluding Remarks.....	30

PART II.

LESSONS OF OBEDIENCE INTRODUCED INTO OUR LITURGY.

1. Recapitulation of the general point of view in which the subject is treated	33
2. Duty of considering these changes as a Divine work.....	35
3. Warnings introduced against the "lawlessness" of the last days.....	37
4. Scripture and Tradition combined in the Prayer Book	40
5. The Collects for Advent.....	41
6. Other new Collects.....	44
7. The Collects for Saints' days	46
8. Verbal alterations on this subject.....	49
9. Omission of the Festival of St. Mary Magdalene	51
10. The Epistles and Gospels	52
11. Service for Passion Week	54
12. The Vow of Obedience at Baptism new	56
13. Other peculiarities new in the Baptismal service	57
14. The Decalogue in the Communion '.....	60
15. The general bearing of this argument on the former	62
16. Reflections	64

PART III.

EXTERNAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CHURCH COINCIDING WITH INTERNAL CHANGES.

1. Such mutual adaptation and concurrence the mark of design	66
CONSIDERED WITH REGARD TO THE FIRST POINT, OF REPENTANCE.	
2. Apparent objections to our being supposed in a state of servitude.....	67
3. Suffering the privilege of Sons	68
4. The strength of the Church in persecution	71
5. Confirmed by the history of our own Church	72
6. Her feebleness and state of servitude	73

	PAGE
7. That states of servitude are Divine appointments	78
8. Such best suited to the condition of the Church	80

CONSIDERED WITH REGARD TO THE SECOND POINT, OF OBEDIENCE.

9. Lessons of obedience the corrective to the tendencies of the age	82
10. Our situation a trial of obedience	85
11. Our recovery of lost privileges depends on obedience	88
12. Dutiful allegiance to our own Church in particular	90
13. Especially necessary at the present crisis.....	92
14. Difficulty of realizing sanguine hopes	95
15. The voice of warning	98

No. 87.

ON RESERVE IN COMMUNICATING RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.

(CONCLUSION.)

Feast of the Purification, 1840.

PART IV.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

1. No argument adduced against the principle: history of the subject in the writer's mind	3
2. Testimony of the early Church full and extensive	6
3. The existence of what has been termed the <i>Disciplina Arcana</i>	8
4. Indications of the principle independent of any known definite system	12
5. The <i>Disciplina</i> a rule of a moral nature	14
6. The whole subject connected with a great religious principle and rule of conduct.....	19
7. Catholic mode of interpreting Scripture founded on this prin- ciple	21
8. High authority for this mode of Scriptural interpretation....	22
9. Reverence and caution observable in the Fathers	25
10. Reserve in revelation not confined to God's word	27
11. Origen's mode of considering the subject as moral not intel- lectual	30
12. The subject discussed at length by St. Clement of Alexandria	34
13. The testimony of the Ancient Church to the doctrine of Christ Crucified	37
14. The practice and principle of the Ancient Church perfectly analogous to our Lord's example	40

PART V.

THE PRINCIPLE OPPOSED TO CERTAIN MODERN RELIGIOUS OPINIONS.

1. The nature of the objections which have been made	42
2. On preaching the word most effectually	46
3. On teaching the doctrine of the Atonement.	47
4. Danger in forming a plan of our own different from that of Scripture.	56
5. Statement of the case from plain moral principles	58
6. All Scripture in perfect harmony as opposed to this modern system	64
7. On eloquent preaching and delivery.	73
8. This system a worldly system	76

PART VI.

THE SYSTEM OF THE CHURCH ONE OF RESERVE.

1. The principle considered with reference to ourselves	83
2. The holiness of God's House of Prayer.	86
3. Sacraments, Church Ordinances, and practices	88
4. The Church realizes the kingdom in secret.	93
5. The best preservative of sound principles	98
6. Caution necessary with respect to the latent senses of Scripture	103
7. Secret religious duties, conversation, and controversy	106
8. Untenable objections on the ground of our present position. .	112
9. This principle more than ever needed	114
10. Want of reverence now prevailing	117
11. Summary of the whole subject	122

No. 88.

THE GREEK DEVOTIONS OF BISHOP ANDREWS, TRANSLATED
AND ARRANGED.

Feast of the Annunciation, 1840.

1. Preparation. Times of Prayer.	3
Places of Prayer	4
Circumstances of Prayer	5
2. Order of early or Matin Prayer— <i>Litany</i> — <i>Confession</i> — <i>Com-</i> <i>mendation</i>	6
3. Order of Evening Prayer— <i>Meditation</i> — <i>Confession</i> — <i>Commen-</i> <i>dation</i>	12

	PAGE
4. Course of Prayer for the Week (for each Day, under the five acts of <i>Confession, Prayer for Grace, Profession, Intercession, and Praise</i> , with an <i>Introduction</i>):—	
First Day	17
Second Day	31
Third Day	38
Fourth Day	46
Fifth Day	56
Sixth Day	62
Seventh Day	70
5. Additional Exercises:—	
A Deprecation	77
A Litany of Deprecation.	78
Forms of Intercession—First	83
Second	84
Third	85
Fourth	86
Meditations on Christian Duty.	87
On the Day of Judgment.	88
On Human Frailness.	90
A Preparation for Holy Communion	92

— " —

1120

nos 89 + 90

— " —

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

ADVENT SERMONS ON ANTICHRIST.

SERMON I.

THE TIMES OF ANTICHRIST.

2 THESS. ii. 3.

“Let no man deceive you by any means : for that Day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.”

THE Thessalonian Christians had supposed that the coming of CHRIST was near at hand. St. Paul writes to warn them against such an expectation. Not that he discountenances their looking out for CHRIST's coming,—the contrary ; but he tells them that a certain event must come before it, and till that was arrived, the end would not be. “That Day shall not come,” he says, “except there come a falling away first.”

As long as the world lasts, this passage of Scripture will be full of reverent interest to Christians. It is their duty ever to be watching for the advent of their LORD, to search for the signs of it in all that happens around them ; and above all to keep in mind this great and awful sign which the text speaks of. At this season of the year, then, when we turn our thoughts to the coming of CHRIST, it is not out of place to review the intimations given us in Scripture concerning His precursor : this I shall now do in several Sermons ; and, in doing so, I shall follow the exclusive guidance of the ancient Fathers of the Church.

I follow the ancient Fathers, not as thinking that on such a subject they have the weight they possess in the instance of doctrines or ordinances. When they speak of doctrines, they speak of

them as being universally held. They are witnesses to the fact of those doctrines being received, not here or there, but every where. We receive those doctrines which they thus hold, not merely because they hold them, but because they bear witness that all Christians every where then held them. We take them as honest informants, but not as a sufficient authority in themselves, though they are an authority too. If they were to state these very same doctrines, but say, "These are our opinions; we deduced them from Scripture, and they are true," we might well doubt about receiving them at their hands. We might fairly say, that we had as much right to deduce from Scripture as they had; that deductions of Scripture were mere opinions; that if our deductions agreed with theirs, that would be a happy coincidence, and increase our confidence in them; but if they did not, it could not be helped—we must follow our own light. Doubtless no man has any right to impose his own deductions upon another, in matters of faith. There is an obvious obligation, indeed, upon the ignorant to submit to those who are better informed; and there is a fitness in the young submitting implicitly for a time to the teaching of their elders; but beyond this, one man's opinion is not better than another's. But this is not the state of the case as regards the primitive Fathers. They do not speak of their *own private* opinion; they do not say, "This is true, *because* we see it in Scripture"—about which there might be differences of judgments—but, "this is true, because in matter of fact it is held, and has ever been held, by all the Churches, down to our times, without interruption, ever since the Apostles:"—where the question is merely one of testimony, whether they had the means of knowing that it had been and was so held; for if it was the belief of so many and independent Churches at once, and that as if from the Apostles, doubtless it cannot but be true and Apostolic.

This, I say, is the mode in which the Fathers speak as regards doctrine; but it is otherwise when they interpret prophecy. In this matter there seems to have been no Catholic, no universal, no openly declared traditions; and when they interpret, they are for the most part giving, and profess to be giving, either their own

private opinions, or uncertain traditions. This is what might have been expected ; for it is not ordinarily the course of Divine Providence to interpret prophecy before the event. What the Apostles disclosed concerning the future, was for the most part disclosed by them in private, to individuals—not committed to writing, not intended for the edifying of the body of CHRIST,—and was soon lost. Thus, in a few verses after the text, St. Paul says, “Remember ye not, that when I was yet with you, I told you these things?” and he writes by hints and allusions, not speaking out. And it shows how little care was taken to discriminate and authenticate his prophetic intimations, that the Thessalonians had taken up an opinion, that he had said—what he had not said—that the Day of CHRIST was immediately at hand.

Yet, though the Fathers do not convey to us the interpretation of prophecy with the same certainty as they convey doctrine, yet in proportion to their agreement, their personal character, and the general reception at the time, or the authority of the sources of the opinions they are stating, they are to be read with deference ; for, to say the least, they are as likely to be right as commentators now ; in some respects more so, because the interpretation of prophecy has become in these times a matter of controversy and party. And passion and prejudice have so interfered with soundness of judgment, that it is difficult to say who is to be trusted in it, or whether a private Christian may not be as good an expositor as those by whom the office has been assumed.

1. Now to turn to the passage in question, which I shall examine by arguments drawn from Scripture, without being solicitous to agree, or to say why I disagree, from modern commentators : “That Day shall not come, except there come a falling away first.” Here it is said that a certain frightful apostasy, and the appearing of the Man of sin, the son of perdition, i. e. as is commonly called, Antichrist, shall precede the coming of CHRIST. Our SAVIOUR seems to add, that it will immediately precede Him, or that His coming will follow close upon it ; for, after speaking of “false prophets” and “false Christs,” “showing signs and wonders,” “iniquity abounding,” and “love waxing cold,”

and the like, He adds, "When ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors." Again He says, "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation. . . . stand in the holy place. . . . then let them that be in Judea flee into the mountains¹." Indeed, St. Paul implies this also, when he says that Antichrist shall be destroyed by the brightness of CHRIST's coming.

If, then, Antichrist is to come immediately before CHRIST, and to be the sign of His coming, it is manifest that he is not come yet, but is still to be expected.

Further, it appears that the time of Antichrist's tyranny will be three years and a half, which is an additional reason for believing he is not come; for, if so, he must have come quite lately, his time being altogether so short; and this we cannot say he has.

Besides, there are two other attendants on his appearance, which have not been fulfilled. First, a time of unexampled trouble. "Then shall be great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be; and except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved²." This has not come. Next, the preaching of the Gospel throughout the world—"And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come³."

Now it may be objected to this conclusion, that St. Paul says, in the passage before us, that "the mystery of iniquity doth already work," i. e. even in *his* day, as if Antichrist had in fact come even then. But he would seem to mean merely this, that in his day there were shadows and forebodings, earnest and operating elements of that which was one day to come in its fullness. Just as the types of CHRIST went before CHRIST, so the shadows of Antichrist precede him. In truth, every event in this world is a type of those that follow, history proceeding forward as a circle ever enlarging. The days of the Apostles typified the last days: there were false Christs, and troubles, and

¹ Matt. xxiv. 16. 33.

² Ib. 21, 22.

³ Ib. 14.

the true CHRIST came in judgment to destroy the Jewish Church. In like manner every age presents its own picture of those future events, which alone are the real fulfilment of the prophecy which stands at the head of all of them. Hence St. John says, "Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that the Antichrist shall come, *even now* are there many Antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time¹." Antichrist was come, and was not come; it was, and it was not the last time. In the sense in which the Apostle's day was the end of the world, it was also the time of Antichrist.—However, a second objection may be made, as follows: St. Paul says, "Now ye know what withholdeth, that he (Antichrist) might be revealed in his time." Here a something is mentioned as keeping back the manifestation of the enemy of truth. The Apostle proceeds: "He that now withholdeth, will, until he be taken out of the way." Now this restraining power being generally admitted to be the Roman empire, and the Roman empire (it is argued) having long been taken out of the way, therefore Antichrist has long since come. I grant that "he that withholdeth," or "letteth," means the power of Rome, for all the ancient writers so speak of it. I grant that as Rome, according to the prophet Daniel's vision, succeeded Greece, so Antichrist succeeds Rome, and our SAVIOUR CHRIST succeeds Antichrist². But it does not hence follow that Antichrist is come; for I do not grant that the Roman empire is gone. Far from it: the Roman empire remains even to this day. It had a very different fate from the other three monsters mentioned by the Prophet; as will be seen by his description of it. "Behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it *was diverse from all the beasts that were before it, and it had ten horns*³." These ten horns, an Angel informed him, "are ten kings that shall arise out of this kingdom" of Rome. As, then, the ten horns belonged to the beast, and were not separate from it, so are the kingdoms into which the Roman empire has been

¹ 1 John ii. 18.² Chrysostom in loco.³ Dan. vii. 7.

divided, part of that empire itself,—a continuation of that empire in the view of *prophecy*, however we decide the *historical* question. And as the horns, or kingdoms, still exist, as a matter of fact, consequently we have *not* yet seen the end of the Roman empire. “That which withholdeth” still exists, though in its ten horns; till it is removed, Antichrist will not come. And out of them he will arise, as the same Prophet informs us: “I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn. . . . and behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.”

2. Now, in the next place, what is told us about Antichrist by the sacred writers? This first of all, as has been already noticed, that he embodies a certain spirit, which existed even in the days of the Apostles. “The mystery of iniquity doth *already* work.” “*Even now* there are many Antichrists¹.” And *what* that spirit is, St. John declares in a subsequent chapter. “Every spirit that confesseth not that JESUS CHRIST is come in the flesh, is not of God; and *this* is that spirit of the Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and *even now already* is it in the world².” Here we see what its *doctrine* is to be; but on that I shall not here enlarge. I am speaking of its working, which had begun in the days of the Apostles, and has doubtless continued ever since. Doubtless this malignant principle has been at work since from time to time, though kept under by him that “withholdeth.” Nay, for what we know, at this very time there is a fierce struggle, the spirit of Antichrist attempting to rise, and the political power in those countries which are prophetically Roman, firm and vigorous in repressing it. What that spirit is, it would be beside my purpose here to attempt to ascertain, any more than to enlarge upon its doctrine; though certainly there is at this very time, as in the days of our fathers, a fierce and lawless principle every where at work,—a spirit of rebellion against God and man, which the powers of government in each country can barely keep under with their greatest efforts. Whether this which we witness *be* that spirit of Antichrist, which is one day

¹ 1 John ii. 18.

² Ib. iv. 3.

to be let loose¹, this ambitious spirit, the parent of all heresy, schism, sedition, revolution, and war,—whether this be so or not, certainly the present framework of society and government, as far as it is the representative of Roman power, would seem to be that which withholdeth, and Antichrist is that which will rise when this restraint fails.

8. It has been more or less implied in the foregoing remarks, that Antichrist is one man, an individual, not a power or a kingdom. Such surely is the impression left on the mind by the Scripture notices concerning him, after taking fully into account the figurative character of prophetic language; and such was the universal belief of the early Church. Consider these passages together, which describe him, and see whether we must not so conclude. First, the text and following verses: "That day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who is the adversary and rival of all that is called God or worshipped; so that he sitteth as God in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God. . . . Then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming. . . . whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders." Next, the following passages in the prophet Daniel: "Another shall rise after them, and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end." Again: "In his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom; but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries. . . . And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he corrupt by flatteries; but the people that do know their God shall be strong,

¹ Vide Dodsworth's Second Advent: *Appendix*.

and do exploits. And the king shall do according to his will ; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished. Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any god ; for he shall magnify himself above all. But in his estate shall he honour the God of forces, and a God whom his fathers knew not shall he honour with gold and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things¹." Let it be observed, that Daniel elsewhere describes other kings, and that the event has shown them to be individuals, as is generally confessed. And in like manner St. John : " There was given unto him a mouth speaking great things, and blasphemies ; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme His Name, and His tabernacle, 'and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them ; and power was given him over all kindreds and tongues and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world²."

Further, that by Antichrist is meant some one person is made probable by the anticipations, which have already occurred in history, of its fulfilment in this way. Individuals have arisen actually answering in a great measure to the above descriptions ; and this circumstance creates a probability, that the absolute and entire fulfilment which is to come will be in an individual also. The most remarkable of these shadows of the coming evil appeared before the time of the Apostles, between them and the age of Daniel, viz. the heathen king Antiochus, of whom we read in the books of Maccabees. This instance is the more to the purpose, because he is actually described, (as we suppose) by Daniel, in another part of his prophecy, in terms which seem also to belong to Antichrist, and as belonging, imply that Antiochus *was* what he seems to be, a type of that more fearful enemy of

¹ Dan. vii. xi.

² Rev. xiii.

the Church. This Antiochus was the savage persecutor of the Jews, in their latter times, as Antichrist will be of the Christians. A few passages from the Maccabees will show you what he was. St. Paul in the text speaks of an apostasy, and of Antichrist as following upon it; thus is the future typified in the Jewish history. "In those days went there out of Israel wicked men, who persuaded many, saying, Let us go and make a covenant with the heathen that are round about us: for since we departed from them, we have had much sorrow. So this device pleased them well. Then certain of the people were so forward herein, that they went to the king, who gave them licence to do after the ordinances of the heathen; whereupon they built a place of exercise at Jerusalem according to the custom of the heathen; and made themselves uncircumcised, and forsook the holy covenant, and joined themselves to the heathen, and were sold to do mischief." After this introduction the Enemy of truth appears. "After that Antiochus had smitten Egypt, he returned again, . . . and went up against Israel and Jerusalem with a great multitude, and entered proudly into the sanctuary, and took away the golden altar, and the candlestick of light and all the vessels thereof, and the table of the shewbread, and the pouring vessels, and the vials, and the censers of gold, and the veil, and the crowns, and the golden ornaments that were before the temple, all which he pulled off. And when he had taken all away, he went into his own land, having made a great massacre, and spoken very proudly." After this, he set fire to Jerusalem, "and pulled down the houses and walls thereof on every side. . . . Then built they the city of David with a great and strong wall, . . . and they put therein a sinful nation, wicked men, and fortified themselves therein." Next, "King Antiochus wrote to his whole kingdom, that all should be one people, and every one should leave his laws: so all the heathen agreed according to the commandment of the king. Yea, many also of the Israelites consented to his religion, and sacrificed unto idols, and profaned the sabbath." After this he forced these impieties upon the Israelites. All were to be put to death who would not "profane the sabbath and festival days, and pollute the sanctuary and holy people: and set up

altars, and groves, and chapels of idols, and sacrifice swine's flesh and unclean beasts," and "leave their children uncircumcised." At length he set up an idol, or in the words of the history, "the Abomination of Desolation upon the altar, and builded idol altars throughout the cities of Juda on every side. . . . And when they had rent in pieces the books of the law which they found, they burnt them with fire." It is added, "Howbeit many in Israel were fully resolved and confirmed in themselves not to eat any unclean thing, wherefore they chose rather to die . . . and there was very great wrath upon Israel¹." Here we have presented to us some of the lineaments of Antichrist, who will be such, and worse than such, as Antiochus.

The history of the apostate emperor Julian, who lived between 300 and 400 years after Christ, furnishes another approximation to the predicted Antichrist, and an additional reason for thinking he will be one person, not a kingdom, power, or the like.

So again does the false prophet Mahomet, who propagated his imposture about 600 years after Christ came.

And there have been events in our childhood, and in the generation before us, which seem to give still additional probability to the notion, that Antichrist is one, not many men acting together.

What I have said upon this subject may be summed up as follows :—that the coming of Christ will be immediately preceded by a very awful and unparalleled outbreak of evil, called in the text an apostasy, a falling away, in the midst of which a certain terrible man of sin and child of perdition, the special and singular enemy of Christ, or Antichrist, will appear ; that this will be when revolutions prevail, and the present framework of Society breaks to pieces ; that at present the Spirit which he will embody and represent, is kept under by "the powers that be," but that on their dissolution, he will rise out of the bosom of them, and knit them together again in his own evil way, under his own rule, to the exclusion of the Church.

4. It would be out of place to say more than this at present.

¹ 1 Macc. i.

I will conclude by directing your attention to one particular circumstance contained in the text, which I have already in part commented on.

It is said there will "come a falling away, and the man of sin will be revealed." In other words the man of sin is born of an apostasy, or at least comes into power through an apostasy, or is preceded by an apostasy, or would not be except for an apostasy. So says the inspired text: now observe, how remarkably the course of providence, as seen in history, has commented on this prediction.

First, we have a comment in the instance of Antiochus previous to the prophecy, as I have already shown. The Israelites, or at least great numbers of them, discarded their own sacred religion, *and then* the enemy was allowed to come in.

Next the apostate emperor Julian, who attempted to overthrow the Church by craft, and introduce paganism back again: he was preceded, nay he was nurtured, in the first great heresy which disturbed the peace and purity of the Church. About forty years before he came to the throne arose the pestilent Arian heresy which denied that CHRIST was GOD. It eat its way among the rulers of the Church like a canker, and what with the treachery of some and the mistakes of others, at one time it was all but dominant throughout Christendom. The few holy and faithful men, who witnessed for the Truth, cried out, with awe and terror at the apostasy, that Antichrist was coming. They called it the "forerunner of Antichrist¹." And true, his Shadow came. Julian was educated in the bosom of Arianism by some of its principal upholders. His tutor was the Eusebius from whom its partisans took their name; and in due time he fell away to paganism, became a hater and persecutor of the Church, and was cut off before he had reigned out the brief period which will be the real Antichrist's duration.

The next great heresy, and in its consequences far more lasting and far spreading, was of twofold character,—with two

¹ πρόδρομος Ἀντιχρίστου.—Νῦν δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποστασία· ἀπίστησαν γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῆς ὁρθῆς πίστεως· αὕτη τοίνυν ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποστασία, καὶ μέλλει προσδοκᾶσθαι ὁ ἄχθρός. Cyril. Catech. 15. n. 9.

heads, as I may call them, Nestorianism and Eutychianism, apparently opposed to each other, yet acting towards a common end : it in one way or other denied the truth of CHRIST's gracious incarnation, and tended to destroy the faith of Christians not less certainly though more insidiously than the heresy of Arius. It spread through the East and through Egypt, corrupting and poisoning those Churches which had once, alas ! been the most flourishing, the early abodes and the strong holds of revealed truth. Out of this heresy, or at least by means of it, the impostor Mahomet sprang, and formed his creed. Here is another especial Shadow of Antichrist.

As to the third and last instance, which I might mention in the generation immediately before ourselves, I will but observe that in like manner, the Shadow of Antichrist arose out of an apostasy, an apostasy to infidel doctrines, perhaps the most flagitious and blasphemous which the world has ever seen.

These instances give us this warning. Is the enemy of CHRIST, and His Church, to arise out of a certain special falling away from God ? And is there no reason to fear that some such Apostasy is gradually preparing, gathering, hastening on in this very day ? For is there not at this very time a special effort made almost all over the world, that is, every here and there, more or less, in sight or out of sight, in this or that place, but most visibly or formidably in its most civilized and powerful parts, an effort to do without religion ? Is there not an opinion avowed and growing ; that a nation has nothing to do with religion ; that it is merely a matter for each man's own conscience,—which is all one with saying that we may let the truth fail from the earth without trying to continue it ? Is there not a vigorous and united movement in all countries to cast down the Church of Christ from power and place ? Is there not a feverish and ever busy endeavour to get rid of the necessity of religion in public transactions ? for example, an attempt to get rid of oaths, under a pretence that they are too sacred for affairs of common life, instead of providing that they be taken more reverently and more suitably ? an attempt to educate without religion,—that is, by putting all forms of religion together, which comes to the same thing ? an attempt

to enforce temperance, and the virtues which flow from it, without religion, by means of societies which are built on mere principles of utility? an attempt to make *expedience*, and not *truth* the end and the rule of measures of state and the enactments of law? an attempt to make numbers, and not truth, the ground of maintaining, or not maintaining this or that creed, as if we had any reason whatever in Scripture for thinking that the many will be in the right, and the few in the wrong? An attempt to deprive the Bible of its one meaning to the exclusion of others, to make people think that it may have a hundred meanings all equally good, or in other words, that it has no meaning at all, is a dead letter, and may be put aside? an attempt to supersede religion altogether, as far as it is external or objective, as far as it is displayed in ordinances, or can be expressed by written words, —to confine it to our inward feelings, and thus, considering how transient, how variable, how evanescent our feelings are, an attempt in fact, to destroy religion?

Surely, there is at this day a confederacy of evil, marshalling its hosts from all parts of the world, organizing itself, taking its measures, enclosing the Church of CHRIST as in a net, and preparing the way for a general apostasy from it. Whether this very apostasy is to give birth to Antichrist, or whether he is still to be delayed, we cannot know; but at any rate this apostasy, and all its tokens, and instruments, are of the Evil One and savour of death. Far be it from any of us to be of those simple ones, who are taken in that snare which is circling around us! Far be it from us to be seduced with the fair promises in which Satan is sure to hide his poison! Do you think he is so unskilful in his craft, as to ask you openly and plainly to join him in his warfare against the Truth? No; he offers you baits to tempt you. He promises you civil liberty; he promises you equality; he promises you trade and wealth; he promises you a remission of taxes; he promises you reform. This is the way in which he conceals from you the kind of work to which he is putting you; he tempts you to rail against your rulers and superiors; he does so himself, and induces you to imitate him; or he promises you illumination,—he offers you knowledge, science, philosophy,

enlargement of mind. He scoffs at times gone by ; he scoffs at every institution which reveres them. He prompts you what to say, and then listens to you, and praises you, and encourages you. He bids you mount aloft. He shows you how to become as gods. Then he laughs and jokes with you, and gets intimate with you ; he takes your hand, and gets his fingers between yours, and grasps them, and then you are his.

Shall we Christians, sons of God, brethren of CHRIST, heirs of glory, shall we allow ourselves to have lot or part in this matter ? Shall we even with our little finger help on the Mystery of iniquity which is travailing for birth, and convulsing the earth with its pangs ? “ Oh my soul come not thou into their secret ; unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united ¹.” “ What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness ? and what communion hath light with darkness ? And what concord hath CHRIST with Belial ? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel ? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols ? for ye are the temple of the living God. Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate . . . and touch not the unclean thing ²,” lest you be workers together with God’s enemies, and be opening the way for the Man of sin, the son of perdition.

¹ Gen. xlix. 6.

² 2 Cor. vi. 14—17.

SERMON II.

THE RELIGION OF ANTICHRIST.

1 JOHN iv. 3.

"Every spirit that confesseth not that JESUS CHRIST is come in the flesh, is not of GOD, and this is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world."

ST. JOHN tells us in these words what the characteristic of the Antichrist should be who is to come; viz. that he shall openly deny our Lord JESUS CHRIST to be the SON of GOD come in the flesh from heaven. So exactly and fully was this description to answer to him, that to deny CHRIST might be suitably called the spirit of Antichrist; and the deniers of Him might be said to have the spirit of Antichrist, to be like Antichrist, to be Antichrists. The same thing is stated in a former chapter. "Who is the Liar, but he that denieth that JESUS is the CHRIST? he is the Antichrist, that denieth the FATHER and the SON. Whosoever denieth the SON, the same hath not the FATHER¹;" from which words, moreover, it would appear that Antichrist will be led on from rejecting the SON of GOD, to the rejection of GOD altogether, either by implication or practically.

I shall now make some further observations on the characteristic marks of the predicted enemy of the Church; and, as in those I made last week, I shall confine myself to the interpretations of Scripture given by the early Fathers.

¹ 1 John ii. 22, 23.

My reason for doing so is simply this,—that on so difficult a subject as unfulfilled prophecy, I really can have no opinion of my own, nor indeed is it desirable I should have, or at least that I should put it forward in any formal way. The opinion of any one person, even if he were the most fit to form one, could hardly be of any authority, or be worth putting forward by itself; whereas the judgment and views of the early Church claim and attract our especial regard, because for what we know they may be in part derived from traditions of the Apostles, and because they are put forward far more consistently and unanimously than those of any other set of teachers. Thus they have *greater* claims on our attention than those of other writers, be their claims little or great; if they are little, those of others are still less. The only really strong claim which can be made on our belief, is the clear fulfilment of the prophecy. Did we see all the marks of the prophecy satisfactorily answered in the past history of the Church, then we might dispense with authority in the parties setting the proof before us. This condition however can hardly be fulfilled, because the date of Antichrist comes close upon the coming of CHRIST in judgment, and therefore cannot have happened so as to allow of being appealed to. Nor is any history produceable which fulfils all the marks of Antichrist clearly, though some are fulfilled here and there. Nothing then is left us, (if we are to take up any opinion at all,—if we are to profit, as Scripture surely intends, by its warnings concerning the evil which is to come), but to go by the judgment of the Fathers, whether that be of special authority in this matter or not. To them therefore I had recourse last week, and now shall have recourse again. To continue then the subject with the early Fathers as my guides.

1. It seems clear that St. Paul and St. John speak of the same enemy of the Church, from the similarity of their descriptions. They both say, that the spirit itself was already at work in their day. "That spirit of the Antichrist," says St. John in the text, "*is now already* in the world." "The mystery of iniquity doth *already* work," says St. Paul. And they both describe the enemy as characterized by the same especial sin, open infidelity.

St. John says, that "he is the Antichrist that *denieth the FATHER and the SON :*" while St. Paul speaks of him in like manner as "*the adversary and rival of all that is called God, or worshipped ;*" that "he sitteth as God in the temple of God, setting forth himself that he is God." In both these passages, the same blasphemous denial of God and religion is described ; but St. Paul adds, in addition, that he will oppose all existing religion, true or false, "*all that is called God, or worshipped.*"

Two other passages of Scripture may be adduced, predicting the same reckless impiety ; one from the eleventh chapter of Daniel : "The king shall do according to his will ; and he shall exalt himself and magnify himself *above every god*, and shall speak marvellous things *against the God of gods*, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished. . . . Neither shall he regard the God *of his fathers*, nor *the Desire of women*, (that is, as it would appear, the Messiah, to be His mother being the especial privilege and object of hope among the Jewish women), nor *regard any god*—for he shall magnify himself *above all.*"

The other passage is faintly marked with any prophetic allusion in itself, except that all our SAVIOUR's sayings have a deep meaning, and the Fathers take this in particular to have such. "I am come in My FATHER's Name, and ye receive Me not ; if *another shall come in his own name*, him ye will receive !" This they consider to be a prophetic allusion to Antichrist, whom the Jews were to mistake for the Christ. He is to come "in *his own name.*" Not from God, as even the SON of God came, who if any might have come in the power of His essential divinity, not in God's Name, not with any pretence of a mission from Him, but in his own name, by a blasphemous assumption of divine power, thus will Antichrist come.

To the above passages may be added those which speak generally of the *impieties* of the last age of the world, impieties which we may believe will usher in and be completed in Antichrist :

"Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.

¹ John v. 43.

.... Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried: but the wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand'. "In the last days perilous times shall come, for men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof:" "scoffers walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of His coming?" "despising government, presumptuous... self-willed, not afraid to speak evil of dignities.... promising men liberty, while themselves the servants of corruption": and the like.

2. I just now made mention of the Jews: it may be well then to state what was held in the early Church concerning Antichrist's connexion with them.

Our LORD foretold that many should come in His name, saying "I am Christ." It was the judicial punishment of the Jews, as of all unbelievers in one way or another, that having rejected the true Christ, they should take up with a false one; and Antichrist will be the complete and perfect seducer, towards whom all previous ones are approximations, according to the text just quoted, "If another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." To the same purport are St. Paul's words after describing Antichrist; "whose coming," he says, "is... with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the Truth, that they might be saved. And for *this cause* God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the Truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

Hence, considering that Antichrist would pretend to be the Messiah, it was of old the received notion that he was to be of Jewish race and to observe the Jewish rites.

Further, St. Paul says that Antichrist should "sit in the

¹ Dan. xii. 4. 10.

² 2 Pet. iii. 3, 4.

³ 2 Tim. iii. 2—5.

⁴ 2 Pet. ii. 10. 19.

Temple of God;" that is, according to the earlier Fathers, in the *Jewish Temple*. Our Saviour's own words may be taken to support this notion, because He speaks of "the Abomination of Desolation," (which, whatever other meanings it might have, in its fulness denotes Antichrist,) "standing in the *holy place*." Further, the persecution of CHRIST's witnesses which Antichrist will make, is described by St. John as taking place in *Jerusalem*. "Their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, (which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt,) *where also our Lord was crucified*."

Now here a remark may be made. At first sight, I suppose, we should not consider that there was much evidence from the Sacred Text for Antichrist taking part with the Jews, or having to do with their Temple. It is, then, a very remarkable fact that the apostate emperor Julian, who was a type and earnest of the great enemy, should, as he did, have taken part with the Jews, and set about building their Temple. Here the history is a sort of comment on the prophecy, and sustains and vindicates the early interpretations of it which I am relating. Of course I must be understood to mean, and a memorable circumstance it is, that this belief of the Church that Antichrist should be connected with the Jews, was expressed long before Julian's time, and that we still possess the works in which it is contained. We have the writings of two Fathers, both Bishops and martyrs of the Church, who lived at least one hundred and fifty years before Julian, and less than one hundred years after St. John. They both distinctly declare Antichrist's connection with the Jews.

The one of them speaks as follows: "In the Temple which is at Jerusalem the adversary will sit, endeavouring to show himself to be the Christ¹."

And the other says, "Antichrist will be he who shall resuscitate the kingdom of the Jews²."

¹ ... "cujus (Dei) jussu hoc, quod est in Hierosolymis, factum est Templum, ob eas causas quæ a nobis dictæ sunt; in quo adversarius sedebit, tentans semetipsum Christum ostendere, sicut et Dominus ait, 'Quum autem videritis Abominationem desolationis,'" &c. Iren. Hær. v. 25.

² ... ὅτι δίδεικται οὐχ ἕτερον ἀλλ' ἡ ὁ Ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ἐγειρόμενος, &c

What makes this still more observable is that the recent Shadow of Antichrist, whom our fathers or we ourselves saw, by a sort of fatality (so to speak) took up the cause of the Jews and was almost hailed by them as their Messiah, and seemed to be drawn irresistibly towards and to hover about the Holy Land, which the early Church considered would be the scene of Antichrist's exploits.

3. Next let us ask, Will Antichrist profess any sort of religion at all? Neither true God nor false God will he worship: so far is clear, and yet something more, and that obscure, is told us. Indeed, as far as the prophetic accounts go, they seem at first sight incompatible with each other. Antichrist is to "exalt himself over all that is called God or worshipped." He will set himself forcibly against idols and idolatry, as the early teachers agree in declaring. Yet in the book of Daniel we read, "*In his estate shall he honour the God of forces; and a God whom his fathers knew not shall he honour with gold and silver, and with precious stones and pleasant things. Thus shall he do in the most strong holds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory*¹." What is meant by the words translated "God of forces," and afterwards called "a strange God," is quite hidden from us, and probably will be so till the event; but any how some sort of false worship is certainly predicted as the mark of Antichrist, with this prediction the contrary way, that he shall set himself against *all idols*, as well as against the true God. Now it is not at all extraordinary that there should be this contrariety in the prediction, for we know generally that infidelity leads to superstition, and that the men most reckless in their blasphemy are cowards also. They cannot be consistent if they would. But let me notice here again a remarkable coincidence, which is contained in the history of the

καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν Ἰουδαίων βασιλείαν ἀναστήσει. Hippol. de Antichristo, § 25. St. Cyril of Jerusalem also speaks of Antichrist building the Jewish Temple; and he too wrote before Julian's attempt, and (what is remarkable) prophesied it would fail, *because* Julian was *not* the Antichrist, who alone could do it. Vide Ruff. Hist. x. 37.

¹ Dan. xi. 38, 39.

last fifty years,—a coincidence between actual events and prophecy sufficient to show us that the apparent contradiction in the latter may easily be reconciled, though beforehand we may not see how; sufficient to remind us that the all-watchful eye, and the all-ordaining hand of God is still over the world, and that the seeds sown in prophecy above two thousand years since, are not dead, but from time to time, by blade and tender shoot, give earnest of the future harvest. Surely the world is impregnated with unearthly elements, which ever and anon, in unhealthy seasons, give lowering and muttering tokens of the wrath to come!

In that great and famous nation which is near us, once great for its love of CHRIST'S Church, since memorable for deeds of blasphemy, which lead me here to mention it, and now, when it should be pitied and prayed for, made unhappily our own model in too many respects,—followed when it should be condemned, and admired when it should be excused,—in the capital of that powerful and celebrated nation, there took place, as we all well know, within the last fifty years, an open apostasy from Christianity; not from Christianity only, but from every kind of worship which might retain any semblance or pretence of the great truths of religion. Atheism was absolutely professed;—yet in spite of this, it seems a contradiction in terms to say it, a certain sort of worship, and that, as the prophet expresses it, "a strange worship," was introduced. Observe what this was.

I say, they avowed on the one hand Atheism. They prevailed upon an unhappy man, whom their proceedings had forced upon the Church as an Archbishop, to come before them in public and declare that there was no God, and that what he had hitherto taught was a fable. They wrote up over the burial places that death was an eternal sleep. They closed the Churches, they seized and desecrated the gold and silver plate belonging to them, turning these sacred instruments, like Belshazzar, to the use of their impious revellings; they formed mock processions, clad in priestly garments, and singing profane hymns. They annulled the divine ordinance of marriage, resolving it into a mere

civil contract to be made and dissolved at pleasure. These things are but a part of their enormities.

On the other hand, after having broken away from all restraint towards God and man, they gave a name to the reprobate state itself into which they had thrown themselves, and exalted it, that very negation of religion, or rather that real and living blasphemy, into a kind of God. They called it *LIBERTY*, and they *literally* worshipped it as a divinity. It would almost be incredible, that men who had flung off all religion should be at the pains to assume a new and senseless worship of their own devising, whether in superstition or in mockery, were not events so recent and so notorious. After abjuring our *LORD* and *SAVIOUR*, and blasphemously declaring Him to be an impostor, they proceeded to decree, in the public assembly of the nation, the adoration of *Liberty* and *Equality* as divinities; and they appointed festivals besides in honour of *Reason*, the *Country*, the *Constitution*, and the *Virtues*. Further, they determined that tutelary gods, even dead men, may be canonized, consecrated, and worshipped; and they enrolled in the number of these some of the most notorious infidels and profligates of the last century. The remains of the two principal of these were brought in solemn procession into one of their Churches, and placed upon the holy altar itself; incense was offered to them, and the assembled multitude bowed down in worship before one of them,—before what remained on earth of an inveterate enemy of *CHRIST*.

Now, I do not mention all this as considering it the fulfilment of the prophecy, nor, again, as if the fulfilment when it comes will be in this precise way, but merely to point out, what the course of events has shown us in these latter times, that there are ways of fulfilling sacred announcements that seem at first sight contradictory,—that men may oppose every existing worship, true and false, and yet take up a worship of their own from pride, wantonness, policy, superstition, fanaticism, or other reasons.

And further, let it be remarked that there was a tendency in the infatuated people I have spoken of, to introduce the old Roman democratic worship, as if further to show us that Rome,

the fourth monster of the prophet's vision, is not dead. They even went so far as to restore the worship of one of the Roman divinities (Ceres) by name, raised a statue to her, and appointed a festival in her honour. This indeed was inconsistent with exalting themselves "above *all* that is called God;" but I mention it, as I have said, not as throwing light upon the prophecy, but to show that the spirit of old Rome has not passed from the world, though its name is almost extinct.

Still further, it is startling to observe, that that former apostate in the early times, the Emperor Julian, he too was engaged in bringing back Roman Paganism.

Further still, let it be observed that Antiochus too, the Antichrist before CHRIST, the persecutor of the Jews, he too signalled himself in forcing the Pagan worship upon them, introducing it even into the Temple.

We know not what is to come; but this we may safely say, that, improbable as it is that Paganism should ever be publicly restored and enforced by authority for any time, however short, even three years and a half, yet it is far less improbable now than it was fifty years ago, before the event occurred which I have referred to. Who would not have been thought a madman or idiot, before that period, who had conjectured such a portentous approximation to Paganism as actually took place.

4. Now let us recur to the ancient Fathers, and see whether their further anticipations do not run parallel to the events which have since happened.

Antichrist, as they considered, will come out of the Roman Empire just upon its destruction;—that is, the Roman Empire will in its last days divide itself into ten parts, and the enemy will come up suddenly out of it upon these ten, and subdue three of them, or all of them perhaps, and (as the prophet continues) "shall speak great words against the MOST HIGH, and shall wear out the saints of the MOST HIGH, and think to change times and laws, and they shall be given into his hand until a time, times, and the dividing of time¹." Now it is very observable that one of the two early Fathers whom

¹ Dan. vii. 25.

I have already cited¹, expressly says that the ten states (the "toes" of Dan. ii.) which will at length appear, shall be *democracies*. I say this is observable, considering the *present* state of the world, the tendency of things in this day towards democracy, and the instance which has been presented to us of democracy within the last fifty years, in those occurrences in France to which I have already alluded.

Another expectation of the early Church was that the Roman monster, after remaining torpid for centuries, would wake up at the end of the world, and be restored in all its laws and forms; and this too, considering those same recent events to which I have alluded, is certainly worth noticing also. One of the Fathers whom I have already quoted, expressly deduces from a passage in the xiiith chapter of the Apocalypse, that "the system of Augustus, who was founder of the Roman Empire, shall be adopted and established by him (Antichrist), in order to his own aggrandizement and glory. This is the fourth monster whose head was wounded and healed; in that the empire was destroyed and came to nought, and was divided into ten. But at this time Antichrist, as being a man of resources, will heal and restore it; so that it will be active and vigorous once more through the system which he establishes²."

I will but notice one other expectation falling in with the foregoing notion of the re-establishment of Roman power, entertained by the Fathers whom I have cited several times; viz. one concerning the name of Antichrist, as spoken of in the xiiith chapter of Revelations: "Here is wisdom," says the inspired

¹ ...τούτων οὖν ἰσομένων, καὶ τῶν δέκα δακτύλων τῆς εἰκόνης εἰς δημοκρατίας χωρησάντων, καὶ τῶν δέκα κεράτων τοῦ τετάρτου θηρίου εἰς δέκα βασιλείας μερισθέντων, ἴδωμεν σαφέστερον τὰ προκείμενα. Hippol. de Antichristo, § 27.

² ...τοῦτο σημαίνει, ὅτι κατὰ τὸν Αὐτοῦστον νόμον, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία Ῥωμαίων συνίστη, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς κεινύσει καὶ διατάξει ἅπαντα ἐκκυρῶν, διὰ τοῦτου δόξαν ἑαυτοῦ πλείονα περιποιούμενος. Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ θῆριον τὸ τέταρτον, οὗ ἐκλήγη ἡ κεφαλὴ καὶ πάλιν ἰθεραπεύθη, διὰ τὸ καταλυθῆναι αὐτήν, ἢ καὶ ἀτιμασθῆναι, καὶ εἰς δέκα διαδήματα ἀναλυθῆναι. ὅς τότε πανοῦργος ὢν ὥσπερ θεραπεύσει αὐτήν καὶ ἀνανεώσει.... ἐνεργήσει γὰρ καὶ ἰσχύσει πάλιν διὰ τὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ὀριζόμενον νόμον. Hippol. de Antichristo, § 49.

text, "let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast, for it is the number of a man, and his number is six hundred threescore and six." They both give a name, (the letters of which together in Greek make up this number) characteristic of the position of Antichrist as the head of the Roman Empire in its restored state, viz. the word *Latinus*, or the Latin king.

The earlier of these Fathers speaks as follows: "Expect that the empire will first be divided into ten kings; then while they are reigning and beginning to settle and aggrandize themselves, suddenly one will come and claim the kingdom, and frighten them, having for his name the very number 666; him recognize as the Abomination of Desolation. This is implied in the Apostle's saying, 'When they shall say peace and safety, then sudden destruction shall come on them!'" Then he goes on to mention, together with two other words, the name of *Latinos* as answering to the number, and says of it, "This is very probable since it is the name of the last empire;—for the Latins (that is, the Romans) are now in power¹."

The other Father thus speaks: "Since. . . . the wound of the first monster was healed. . . . and it is plain that the Latins are that empire, therefore he is called the Latin King (*Latinus*), the name passing from the empire to an individual²." Whether this anticipation will be fulfilled or not, we cannot say. I only men-

¹ "Scientes firmum numerum qui a Scriptura annunciatu est, id est, sexcentorum sexaginta sex, sustineant primum quidem divisionem regni in decem; post deinde, illis regnantibus et incipientibus corrigere sua negotia, et augere suum regnum, qui de improvviso advenit regnum sibi vindicans et terribit predictos, habens nomen continens predictum numerum, hunc vere cognoscere esse Abominationem desolationis. Hoc et Apostolus ait, 'Quum dixerint,'" &c. *Iren. Hær. v. 30.*

² "Sed et *Λατῆνός* nomen habet sexcentorum sexaginta sex numerum; et valde verisimile est, quoniam novissimum regnum hoc habet vocabulum. Latini enim sunt qui nunc regnant." *Iren. Hær. ibid.* He goes on, however, to say he prefers one of the other words.

³ "... ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ προέφημεν λέγοντες, ὅτι ἐθεραπεύθη ἡ πλῆγη τοῦ θηρίου τοῦ πρώτου, καὶ ποιήσει λαλεῖν τὴν εἰκόνα, τούτεστιν, ἰσχυσεῖ φανερόν δ' ἐστὶ πᾶσιν, ὅτι οἱ κρατοῦντες ἐν νῦν εἰσὶ Λατῆνοι, εἰς ἐνδὸς οὖν ἀνθρώπου ὄνομα μεταγόμενον γίνεται Λατῆνος. *Hipp. de Antichristo, § 50.*

tion it as showing the belief of the Fathers in the restoration and re-establishment of the Roman empire, which has certainly since their day been attempted.

It seems then, on the whole, that, as far as the testimony of the early Church goes, Antichrist will be an open blasphemer, opposing himself to every existing worship, true and false,—a persecutor, a patron of the Jews, and a restorer of their worship, and, further, the author of a novel kind of worship. Moreover, he will appear suddenly, at the very end of the Roman empire, which once was and now sleeps; that he will knit it into one, and engraft his Judaism and his new worship (a sort of Paganism, it may be) upon the old discipline of Cæsar Augustus; that in consequence he will earn the title of the Latin or Roman King, as best expressive of his place and character; lastly, that he will pass away as suddenly as he came.

Now concerning this, I repeat, I do not wish to pronounce how far the early Church was right or wrong in these anticipations, though events since have variously tended to strengthen its general interpretations of Scripture prophecy.

It may be asked, What practical use is there in speaking of these things, if they be doubtful? With a short notice of this objection, I shall conclude.

First, it is not unprofitable to bear in mind that we are still under what may be called a miraculous system. I do not mean to maintain that literal miracles are taking place now, but that our present state is a portion of a providential course, which began in miracle, and at least at the end of the world, if not before, will end in miracle. The particular expectations above detailed may be right or wrong; yet an Antichrist, whoever and whatever he be, is to come; marvels are to come; the old Roman empire is not extinct; the devil, if bound, is bound but for a season; the contest of good and evil is not ended. I repeat it, in the present state of things, when the great object of education is supposed to be the getting rid of things supernatural, when we are bid to laugh and jeer at believing every thing we do not see, are told to account for every thing by things known and ascertained, and to assay every statement by the touchstone of experience, I

must think that this vision of Antichrist, as a supernatural power to come, is a great providential gain, as being a counterpoise to the evil tendencies of the age.

And next, it must surely be profitable for our thoughts to be sent backward and forward to the beginning and the end of the Gospel times, to the first and second coming of CHRIST. What we want, is to *understand* that we are in the place in which the early Christians were, with the same covenant, ministry, sacraments, and duties ;—to realize a state of things long past away ; —to feel that we are in a sinful world, a world lying in wickedness ; —to discern our position in it, that we are witnesses in it, that reproach and suffering are our portion,—so that we must not “ think it strange ” if they come upon us, but a kind of gracious exception if they do not ;—to have our hearts awake, as if we had seen CHRIST and His Apostles, and seen their miracles,—awake to the hope and waiting for His second coming, looking out for it, nay, desiring to see the tokens of it ;—thinking often and much of the judgment to come, dwelling on and adequately entering into the thought, that *we* individually shall be judged. All these surely are acts of true and saving faith ; and this is one substantial use of the Book of Revelations, and other prophetic parts of Scripture, quite distinct from our knowing their real interpretation, viz. to take the veil from our eyes, to lift up the covering which lies over the face of the world, and make us see, day by day, as we go in and out, as we get up and lie down, as we labour, and walk, and rest, and recreate ourselves, the Throne of God set up in the midst of us, His majesty and His judgments, His Son’s continual intercession for the elect, their trials, and their victory.

May God enable us all thus to walk by faith, not by sight, and live in the past and future, not in the present !

SERMON III.

THE CITY OF ANTICHRIST.

REV. xvii. 18.

"The woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth."

THE city spoken of in these words is evidently Rome, which was then the seat of empire all over the earth,—which was supreme even in Judæa. We hear of the Romans all through the Gospels and Acts. Our SAVIOUR was born when His mother, the Blessed Virgin, and Joseph, were brought up to Bethlehem to be taxed by the Roman governor. He was crucified under Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor. St. Paul was at various times protected by the circumstance of his being a Roman citizen; on the other hand, when he was seized and imprisoned, it was by the Roman governors, and at last he was sent to Rome itself, to the emperor, and eventually martyred there, together with St. Peter. Thus the sovereignty of Rome, at the time when CHRIST and His Apostles preached and wrote, which is a matter of historical notoriety, is forced on our notice in the New Testament itself. It is undeniably meant in the text, by the great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth.

The connexion of Rome with the reign and exploits of Antichrist, is so often brought before us in the controversies of the day, that it may be well, after what I have already had occasion to say on the subject of the last enemy of the Church, to consider now what Scripture prophecy says concerning Rome; which I shall attempt to do, as before, with the guidance of the early Fathers.

Now let us observe what the Chapter says, in which the text occurs, concerning Rome, and what we may deduce from it.

This great city is described under the image of a woman, cruel, profligate, and impious. She is described as arrayed in all worldly splendour and costliness, in purple and scarlet, in gold and precious stones, and pearls, as shedding and drinking the blood of the saints, till she was drunken with it. Moreover she is called by the name of "Babylon the Great," to signify her power, wealth, profaneness, pride, sensuality, and persecuting spirit, after the pattern of that former enemy of the Church. I need not here relate how all this really answered to the character and history of Rome at the time St. John spoke of it. There never was a more ambitious, haughty, hardhearted, and worldly people than the Romans; never any, for none else had ever the opportunity, which so persecuted the Church. Christians suffered ten persecutions at their hands, as they are commonly reckoned, and very horrible ones, extending over two hundred and fifty years. The day would fail to go through an account of the tortures they suffered from Rome; so that the Apostle's description was as signally fulfilled afterwards as a prophecy, as it was accurate at the time as an historical notice.

This guilty city, represented by St. John as an abandoned woman, is said to be seated on "a scarlet-coloured monster, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and *ten horns*." Here we are sent back by the prophetic description to the seventh chapter of Daniel, in which the four great empires of the world are shadowed out under the figure of four beasts, a lion, a bear, a leopard, and a nameless monster, "diverse" from the rest, "dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly;" "*and it had ten horns*." This surely is the very same beast which St. John saw: the ten horns mark it. Now this fourth beast in Daniel's vision is the Roman empire; therefore "the beast" on which the woman sat, is the Roman empire. And this agrees very accurately with the actual position of things in history; for Rome, the mistress of the world, might well be said to sit upon, and be carried about triumphantly on that world which she had subdued, and made her creature. Further, the prophet Daniel explains the ten horns

of the beast to be "ten kings that shall arise" out of this empire; in which St. John agrees, saying, "The ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet, but receive power as kings one hour with the beast." Moreover, in a former vision Daniel speaks of the empire as destined to be "divided," as "partly strong and partly broken¹." Further still, this empire, the beast of burden of the woman, was at length to rise against her and devour her, as some savage animal might turn upon its keeper; and it was to do this in the time of its divided or multiplied existence. "The ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate" her, "and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh and burn her with fire." Such was to be the end of the great city. Lastly, three of the kings, perhaps all, are said to be subdued by Antichrist, who is to come up suddenly while they are in power; for such is the course of Daniel's prophecy—"Another shall rise after them, and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings, and he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hands until a time, times, and the dividing of time." This power, who was to rise upon the kings, is Antichrist; and I would have you observe how Rome and Antichrist stand towards each other in the prophecy. Rome is to fall before Antichrist rises; for the ten kings are to destroy Rome, and Antichrist is then to appear and supersede the ten kings. As far as we dare judge from the words, this seems clear. St. John says, "the ten horns shall hate and devour" the woman: and Daniel says, "I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn" with "eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things:"—that is Antichrist.

Now then, let us consider how far these prophecies have been fulfilled, and what seems to remain.

In the first place, the Roman empire did break up, as foretold. It divided into a number of separate kingdoms, such as our own, France, and the like; yet it is difficult to number ten accurately

¹ Dan. ii. 41, 42.

and exactly. Next, though Rome certainly has been desolated in the most fearful and miserable way, yet it has not exactly suffered from ten parts of its own former empire, but from barbarians who came down upon it from regions external to it; and, in the third place, it still exists as a city, whereas it was to be "desolated, devoured, and burned with fire." And, fourthly, there is one point in the description of the ungodly city, which has hardly been fulfilled at all in the case of Rome. She had "a golden cup in her hand full of abominations," and made "the inhabitants of the earth drunk with the wine of her fornication;" expressions which imply surely some seduction or delusion which she was enabled to practise upon the world, and which, I say, has not been fulfilled in the case of that great imperial city upon seven hills of which St. John spake. Let us consider some of these points more at length.

I say, the Roman empire has scarcely yet been divided into ten. The prophet Daniel is conspicuous among the inspired writers for the clearness and exactness of his predictions; so much so, that some infidels, overcome by the truth of them, could only take refuge in the unworthy, and at the same time most unreasonable and untenable supposition, that they were written after the events which they profess to foretell. But we have had no such exact fulfilment in history of the ten kings; therefore we must suppose that it is yet to come. With this accords the ancient notion, that they were to come *at the end of the world*, and last but a *short time*, Antichrist coming upon them. There have, indeed, been approximations to the number, yet, I conceive, nothing more. Now observe how the actual state of things corresponds to the prophecy and to the primitive interpretation of it. It is difficult to say whether the Roman empire is gone or not: in one sense, it is,—for it is divided into kingdoms; in another sense, it is not,—for the date cannot be assigned at which it came to an end, and much might be said in various ways, to show that it might be considered still existing, though in a mutilated and decayed state. But if this be so, and if it is to end in ten vigorous kings, as Daniel says, then it must one day *revise*. Now observe, I say, how the prophetic description answers to this account of it. "The Beast," that is, the Roman empire, "the

Monster that thou sawest, *was and is not*, and *shall* ascend out of the abyss, and go into perdition." Again, mention is made of "the Beast that was, and *is not*, and *yet is*." Again, we are expressly told that the ten kings and the empire shall rise together; the kings appearing at the time of the monster's resurrection, not in its languid and torpid state. "The ten kings have received no kingdom as yet, but receive power as kings one hour with the beast." If, then, the Roman power is still prostrate, the ten kings have not come; and if the ten kings have not come, the destined destroyers of the woman, the full judgments upon Rome, have not yet come.

Thus the full measure of judgment has not fallen upon Rome; yet her sufferings, and the sufferings of her empire, have been very severe. St. Peter seems to predict them, in his First Epistle, as then impending. He seems to imply, that CHRIST's visitation, which was then just occurring, was no local or momentary vengeance upon one people or city, but a solemn and extended judgment of the whole earth, though beginning at Jerusalem. "The time is come," he says, "when judgment must begin at *the house of God* (at the sacred city); and, if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the Gospel of God? And if the righteous scarcely be saved" (i. e. the remnant who should go forth of Zion, according to the prophecy, that chosen seed in the Jewish Church which received CHRIST when He came, and took the new name of Christians, and shot forth and grew far and wide into a fresh Church, or, in other words, the elect whom our SAVIOUR speaks of as being involved in all the troubles and judgments of the devoted people, yet carried safely through); "if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear,"—the inhabitants of the world at large¹?

Here is intimation of the presence of a fearful scourge, which was then going over all the ungodly world, beginning at apostate Jerusalem, and punishing it. Such was the case: vengeance first fell upon the once holy city, which was destroyed by the Romans: it proceeded next against the executioners themselves². The empire was disorganized, and broken to pieces with dissensions and insur-

¹ 1 Pet. iv. 17, 18. Vide also Jer. xxv. 28, 29. Ezek. ix. 6.

² Vide Ia. xlvii. 5, 6.

rections, with plagues, famines, and earthquakes, while countless hosts of barbarians attacked it from the north and east, and portioned it out, and burned and pillaged Rome itself. The judgment, I say, which began at Jerusalem, steadily tracked its way for centuries round and round the world, till at length, with unerring aim, it smote the haughty mistress of all nations herself, the guilty woman seated upon the fourth monster which Daniel saw. I will mention one or two of these fearful inflictions.

Hosts of barbarians came down upon the civilized world, the Roman empire. One multitude,—though multitude is a feeble word to describe them,—invaded France¹, which was living in peace and prosperity under the shadow of Rome. They desolated and burned town and country. Seventeen provinces were made a desert. Eight metropolitan cities were set on fire and destroyed. Multitudes of Christians perished even in the churches.

The fruitful coast of Africa was the scene of another of these invasions². The barbarians gave no quarter to any who opposed them. They tortured their captives of whatever age, rank, and sex, to force them to discover their wealth. They drove away the inhabitants of the cities to the mountains. They ransacked the churches. They destroyed even the fruit-trees, so complete was the desolation.

Of judgments in the course of nature, I will mention three out of a great number. One, an inundation from the sea in all parts of the Eastern empire. The water overflowed the coast for two miles inland, sweeping away houses and inhabitants along a line of some thousand miles. One great city (Alexandria) lost fifty thousand persons³.

The second, a series of earthquakes; some of which were felt all over the empire. Constantinople was thus shaken above forty days together. At Antioch 250,000 persons perished in another.

And in the third place a plague, which lasted (languishing and reviving) through the long period of fifty-two years. In Constantinople during three months there died daily 5000, and at length 10,000 persons. I give these facts from a modern writer,

¹ A. D. 407. Vide Gibbon, Hist. vol. v. chap. 30.

² A. D. 430. Vide

Gibbon, Hist. vol. vi. chap. 33.

³ A. D. 365. Ibid. vol. iv. chap. 26.

who is neither favourable to Christianity, nor credulous in matters of historical testimony. In some countries the population was wasted away altogether, and has not recovered to this day¹.

Such were the scourges by which the fourth monster of Daniel's vision was brought low, "the LORD God's sore judgments, the sword, the famine, and the pestilence²." Such was the process by which "that which letteth," (in St. Paul's language) began to be "taken away;" though not altogether removed even at this day.

And, while the world itself was thus plagued, not less was the offending city which had ruled it. Rome was taken and plundered three several times. The inhabitants were murdered, made captives, or obliged to fly all over Italy. The gold and jewels of the queen of the nations, her precious silk and purple, and her works of art were carried off or destroyed.

These are great and notable events, and certainly form part of the predicted judgment upon Rome; at the same time they do not adequately fulfil the prophecy, which says expressly, on the one hand, that the ten portions of the empire itself which had almost been slain, shall rise up against the city, and "make her desolate and burn her with fire," which they have not yet done; and on the other hand, that the city shall experience a *total* destruction, which has not yet befallen her, for she still exists. St. John's words on the latter point are clear and determinate. "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen; and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird³;" words which would seem to refer us to the curse upon the literal Babylon; and we know how it was fulfilled. The prophet Isaiah had said, that in Babylon "wild beasts of the desert should lie there, and their houses be full of doleful creatures, and owls should dwell there, and satyrs" or devils, "should dance there⁴." And we know that all this has happened to Babylon; it is a heap of ruins; no man dwells there; nay it is difficult to say even where exactly it was placed, so great is the desolation. Such a desolation St. John

¹ A. D. 540. Ibid. vol. vii. chap. 43.

² Ezek. xiv. 21.

³ Rev. xviii. 2.

⁴ Isai. xiii. 21.

seems to predict, concerning the guilty persecuting city we are considering ; and in spite of what she has suffered, such a desolation has not come upon her yet. Again, " she shall be utterly burnt with fire, for strong is the LORD God, who judgeth her." Surely this implies utter destruction, annihilation. Again, " a mighty angel took up a stone, like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and *shall be found no more at all.*"

To these passages I would add this reflection. Surely Rome is spoken of in Scripture as a more inveterate enemy of God and His saints even than Babylon, as the great pollution and bane of the earth : if then Babylon has been destroyed wholly, much more, according to all reasonable conjecture, will Rome be destroyed one day.

It may be further observed, that serious men in the early Church certainly thought that the barbarian invasions were not all that Rome was to receive in the way of vengeance, but that God would one day destroy it by the fury of the elements. " Rome," says one of them, at a time when a barbarian conqueror had possession of the city, and all things seemed to threaten its destruction, " Rome shall not be destroyed by the nations, but shall consume away internally, worn out by storms of lightning, whirlwinds, and earthquakes¹."

This is what may be said on the one side, but after all something may be said on the other ; not indeed to show that the prophecy is already fully accomplished, for it certainly is not, but to show that, granting this, what accomplishment remains has reference not to Rome, but to some other object or objects of divine vengeance. I shall explain my meaning under two heads.

1. First, why has not Rome been destroyed hitherto ? how was it that the barbarians left it ? Babylon sunk under the

¹ Greg. Dial. li. 15. Dr. Burton, *Antiq. of Rome*, p. 475, quotes the following passage of St. Malachi's prophecy, (A. D. 1130,) about the line of the Popes, which seems to look the same way. " In the last persecution of the Holy Church, Peter of Rome shall be on the throne, who shall feed his flock in many tribulations. When these are past, the city upon seven hills shall be destroyed, and the awful Judge shall judge the people."

avenger whom God brought against it—Rome has not : why is this ? for if there has been a something to procrastinate the vengeance due to Rome hitherto, peradventure that obstacle may act again and again, and stay the uplifted hand of divine wrath till the end come. The cause seems to be simply this, that when the barbarians came down, God had a people in that city. Babylon was a mere prison of the Church ; Rome had received her as a guest. The Church dwelt in Rome, and while her children suffered in the heathen city from the barbarians, so again they were there the life and the salt of the city where they suffered.

Christians understood this at the time, and availed themselves of their position. They remembered Abraham's intercession for Sodom, and the gracious announcement made him, that had there been ten righteous men therein, it would have been saved.

When the city was worsted, threatened, and at length overthrown, the Pagans had cried out that *Christianity* was the cause of this. They said they had always flourished under their idols, and that these idols and devils (gods as they called them) were displeased at them for the numbers among them who had been converted to the faith of the Gospel, and had in consequence deserted them, given them over to their enemies, and brought vengeance upon them. On the other hand, they scoffed at the Christians, saying in effect, "Where is now your God ? Why does He not save you ? You are not better off than we ;"—like the impenitent thief, "If Thou be the CHRIST, save Thyself and us ;" or, like the multitude, "If He be the SON of God, let Him come down from the Cross." This was during the time of one of the most celebrated bishops and doctors of the Church, St. Austin ; and he replied to their challenge. He replied to them, and to his brethren also, some of whom were offended and shocked that such calamities should have happened to a city which had become Christian¹. He pointed to the cities which had already sinned and been visited, and showed that they had altogether perished, whereas Rome was still preserved. Here then he said was the very fulfilment of the promise of God, an-

¹ Austin, de Urbis Excidio, vol. vi. p. 622. Ed. Ben. et de Civ. Dei, i. 1—7.

nounced to Abraham; for the sake of the Christians in it, Rome was chastised, not overthrown utterly.

Historical facts support St. Augustine's view of things: God showed visibly, not only provided secretly, that the Church should be the salvation of the city. The fierce conqueror, Alaric, who first came against it, exhorted his troops, "to respect the Churches of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, as holy and inviolable sanctuaries;" and he gave orders that a quantity of plate consecrated to St. Peter should be removed into his Church from the place where it had been discovered¹.

Again, fifty years afterwards, when Attila was advancing against the city, the bishop of Rome of the day, St. Leo, formed one of a deputation of three, who went out to meet him, and was successful in arresting his purpose. A few years afterwards, Genseric, the most savage of the barbarian conquerors, appeared before the defenceless city. The same fearless prelate went out to meet him at the head of his clergy, and though he did not avail to save the city from pillage, yet he gained a promise that the unresisting multitude should be spared, the buildings protected from fire, and the captives from torture². Thus from the Goth, Hun, and Vandal, did the Christian Church shield the guilty city in which she dwelt. What a wonderful rule of God's providence is herein displayed, which occurs daily! the Church sanctifies yet suffers with the world, sharing its sufferings yet lightening them. In the case before us, it has (if we may humbly say it,) suspended, to this day, the vengeance destined to fall upon her who was drunk with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. That vengeance has never fallen; it is still suspended; nor can reason be given *why* Rome has not fallen under the rule of God's general dealings with His rebellious creatures, and suffered (according to the prophecy), the fulness of God's wrath begun in her, except that a Christian Church is still in that city, sanctifying it, interceding for it, saving it. That part of the Christian Church, (alas!) has in process of time become infected with the sins of Rome itself, and learned to be ambitious and cruel after the fashion of those who possessed the place afore-

¹ Vide Gibbon, Hist. vol. v. chap. 31.

² Ibid. vol. vi. chap. 35, 36.

times¹. Yet if it were what some would make it, if it were as reprobate as heathen Rome itself, what stays the judgment long ago begun? why does not the Avenging Arm, which made its first stroke ages since, deal its second and its third, till the city has fallen? why is not Rome as Sodom and Gomorrah, if there be no righteous men in it?

This then is the first remark I would make as to the fulfilment of the prophecy which is yet to come; perchance, through God's mercy, it may be procrastinated even to the end, and never be fulfilled. Of this we can know nothing one way or the other.

2. Secondly, let it be considered, that as Babylon is a type of Rome, and of the world of sin and vanity, so Rome in turn may be a type also, whether of some other city, or of a proud and deceiving world. The woman is said to be Babylon as well as Rome, and as she is something more than Babylon, namely, Rome, so again she may be something more than Rome, which is yet to come. Various great cities in Scripture, are made, in their ungodliness and ruin, types of the world itself. Their end is described in figures which in their fulness apply only to the end of the world; the sun and moon are said to fall, the earth to quake, and the stars to fall from heaven². As then their ruin prefigures a greater and wider judgment, so the chapters of which the text forms a part may have a further accomplishment not in Rome, but in the world itself, or some other great city to which we cannot at present apply them, or to all the great cities of the world together, and to the spirit that rules in them, their avaricious, luxurious, self-dependent, irreligious spirit. And in this sense is already fulfilled a portion of the chapter before us, which does not apply to heathen Rome; I mean the description of the woman as making men drunk with her sorceries and delusions; for such, surely, nothing but an intoxication is that arrogant, ungodly, falsely liberal, and worldly spirit, which great cities spread through a country.

¹ No opinion, one way or the other, is here expressed as to the question, how far, as the local Church has saved Rome, so Rome has corrupted the local Church, or whether the local Church in consequence, or again whether other Churches elsewhere, may or may not be types of Antichrist.

² Vide Isai. xiii. 10, &c.

To sum up what I have said. The question asked was, Is not (as is commonly said and believed among us) Rome mentioned in the Apocalypse, as having especial share in the events which will come at the end of the world by means or after the time of Antichrist. I answer this, that Rome's judgments have come on her in great measure, when her empire was taken from her ; that her persecutions of the Church have been in great measure judged, and the Scripture predictions concerning her fulfilled ; that whether or not, she shall be further judged depends on two circumstances, first, whether "the righteous men" in the city who saved her when her judgment first came may not, through God's great mercy, be allowed to save her still ; next, whether the prophecy relates in its fulness to Rome or to some other object or objects of which Rome is a type. And further, I say, that if Rome is still to be judged, this must be before Antichrist comes, because Antichrist comes upon and destroys the ten kings, and lasts but a short space, but the ten kings are to destroy Rome. On the other hand, so far would seem to be clear, that the prophecy itself has not been fully accomplished, whatever we decide about Rome's concern in it. The Roman empire has not yet been divided into ten heads, nor has it yet risen against the woman, whoever she stands for, nor has the woman yet received her ultimate judgment.

We are warned against sharing in her sins, and in her punishment. How shall we feel when the end comes, if we be found mere children of this world and of its great cities ; with tastes, opinions, habits, such as are found in its cities ; with a heart dependent on human society, and a reason moulded by it ! What a miserable lot will be ours at the last day, to find ourselves before our Judge, with all the low feelings, principles, and aims which the world encourages ; with our thoughts wandering (if that be possible then), wandering after vanities ; with thoughts which rise no higher than the consideration of our own comforts, or our gains ; with a haughty contempt for the Church, her ministers, her lowly people ; a love of rank and station, an admiration of the splendour and the fashions of the world, an affectation of refinement, a dependence upon our powers of reason,

an habitual self-esteem, and an utter ignorance of the number and the heinousness of the sins which lie against us ! And when the judgment is over, and the saints have gone up to heaven, and there is silence and darkness where all was so full of life and expectation, where shall we find ourselves ? Men now give fair names to sins and sinners ; but then all the citizens of Babylon will appear in their true colours, as the word of God exhibits them, “ as dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and lovers and makers of lies.”

SERMON IV.

THE PERSECUTION OF ANTICHRIST.

DAN. xii. 1.

"There shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book."

WE have been so accustomed to hear of the persecutions of the Church, both from the New Testament and from the history of Christianity, that it is well if we have not at length come to regard the account as words of course, to speak of them without understanding what we say, and to receive no practical benefit from having been told of them: much less are we likely to take them for what they really are, a characteristic mark of Christ's Church. They are not indeed the *necessary* lot of the Church, but at least one of her appropriate badges; so that on the whole, looking at the course of history, you might set down persecution as one of the peculiarities by which you recognize her. And our Lord seems to intimate how becoming, how natural persecution is to the Church, by placing it among His Beatitudes. "Blessed are they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven;" giving it the same high and honourable rank in the assemblage of evangelical graces, which the Sabbath holds among the ten Commandments,—I mean, as a sort of sign and token of His followers, and, as such, placed in the moral code, though in itself external to it.

He seems to show us this in another way, viz., as intimating

to us the fact, that in persecution the Church begins and ends. He left her in persecution, and He will find her in persecution. He recognizes her as His own,—He framed, and He will claim her,—as a persecuted Church, bearing His Cross. And that awful relic of Him which He gave her, and which she is found with at the end, she cannot have lost by the way.

The text speaks of the great persecution yet to come—and seems referred to by our LORD in His solemn prophecy before His passion, in which He comprises both series of events, both those which attended His first, and those which will attend at His second coming—both persecutions of His Church, the early and the late. He speaks as follows: “Then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be; and except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect’s sake those days shall be shortened¹.”

Having been led, at this season of the year, to speak of that dreadful visitation which will precede the return of CHRIST to judge the world, I mean the coming of Antichrist, I will end the subject now with a few brief remarks on the persecution which will attend it. In saying that a persecution will attend it, I do but speak the opinion of the early Church, as I have tried to do all along, and shall do in what follows.

First, I will cite some of the principal texts which seem to refer to this last persecution.

“Another shall rise after them, and . . . he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time, times, and the dividing of time²:”—i. e. three years and a half.

“They shall pollute the Sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the Daily Sacrifice, and they shall place the Abomination that maketh desolate, and such as do wickedly against the Covenant shall be corrupt by flatteries; but the people that do know their God shall be strong and do exploits. And they that

¹ Matt. xxiv. 21, 22.

² Dan. vii. 24, 25.

understand among the people, shall instruct many; yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days¹."

"Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly....and from the time that the Daily Sacrifice shall be taken away, and the Abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days²."

"Then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world³," and so on, as I just now read it.

"The beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them....And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another, because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth⁴."

"And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days⁵."

"And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme His name, and His tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven: and it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them...and all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world⁶."

"I saw an Angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand; and he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years....and after that he must be loosed a little season....and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom

¹ Dan. xi. 31—33.

² Dan. xii. 10, 11.

³ Matt. xxiv. 21.

⁴ Rev. xi. 7—10.

⁵ Rev. xii. 6.

⁶ Rev. xiii. 5—8.

is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city¹."

These passages were understood by the early Christians to relate to the persecution, which was to come in the last times ; and they seem, evidently, to bear upon them that meaning. Our SAVIOUR's words, indeed, about the fierce trial which was coming, might seem at first sight to refer to the early persecutions, those to which the first Christians were exposed ; and doubtless so they do : yet, violent as these persecutions were, they were not considered by those who suffered them to be the proper fulfilment of the prophecy ; and this surely is itself a strong reason for thinking they were not so. And it is confirmed by parallel passages, such as the text, which certainly speak of a persecution still future ; yet surely our SAVIOUR used the very words of the text, and referred to what it refers to ; and therefore, whatever partial accomplishment His prediction had in the early Church, He surely speaks of nothing short of the last persecution when His words are viewed in their full scope. He says, "There shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be : and except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved ; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." And immediately after, "There shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders ; in-somuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." In accordance with this language, the text says, "There shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time : and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." One of the passages I quoted from the Revelations says the same, and as strongly : "It was given him to make war with the Saints, and to overcome them. . . . and all that dwell on the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life²."

¹ Rev. xx. 1—9.

² Rev. xiii. 7, 8.

Let us then apprehend and realize the idea, thus clearly brought before us, that, sheltered as the Church has been from persecution for 1500 years, yet a persecution awaits it, before the end, fierce and more perilous than any which occurred at its first rise.

Further, this persecution is to be attended with the cessation of all religious worship. "They shall take away the Daily Sacrifice,"—words which the early Fathers interpret to mean, that Antichrist will suppress for three years and a half all religious worship. St. Augustin questions whether baptism even will be administered to infants during that season¹.

And further, we are told: "They shall place the Abomination that maketh desolate,"—they shall "set it up:" our SAVIOUR declares the same. What this means we cannot pronounce. In the former fulfilment of this prophecy, it has been the introduction of heathen idols into God's house.

Moreover the reign of Antichrist will be supported, it would appear, with a display of miracles, such as the magicians of Egypt effected against Moses. On this subject, of course, we wait for a fuller explanation of the prophetic language, such as the event alone can give us. So far, however, is clear, that whether real miracles or not, whether pretended, or the result, as some have conjectured, of discoveries in physical science, they will produce the same effect as if they were real, viz. the overpowering the imaginations of such as have not the love of God deeply lodged in their hearts,—of all but the elect. Scripture is remarkably precise and consistent in this prediction. "Signs and wonders," says our LORD, "insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." St. Paul speaks of Antichrist as one "whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the Truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie?" And St. John: "He doeth great wonders, so that He maketh fire come down from

¹ Augustine.

² 2 Thess. ii. 9—11.

heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast¹."

In these four respects, then, not to look for others, will the last persecution be more awful than any of the earlier ones: in its being in itself fiercer and more horrible; in its being attended by a cessation of the ordinances of grace, "the Daily Sacrifice;" and by an open and blasphemous establishment of infidelity, or some such enormity, in the holiest recesses of the Church; lastly, in being supported by a power of working miracles. Well is it for Christians that the days are shortened!—shortened for the elect's sake, lest they should be overwhelmed,—shortened, as it would seem, to three years and a half.

Much might be said, of course, on each of these four particulars; but I will confine myself to making one remark on the first of them, the sharpness of the persecution.—It is to be worse than any persecution before it. Now, to understand the force of this announcement, we should understand in some degree what those former persecutions were.

This it is very difficult to do in a few words; yet a very slight survey of the history of the Church will convince us that cruelties more shocking than those which the early Christians suffered from their persecutors, are beyond our conception beforehand. St. Paul's words, speaking of the persecutions prior to his time, but faintly describe the trial which came upon the Church in his day and afterwards. He says of the Jewish saints, "They were tortured, not accepting deliverance" they "had trials of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea moreover of bonds and imprisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented." Such were the trials of the Prophets under the Law, who in a measure anticipated the Gospel, as in doctrine, so in suffering; yet the suffering, when the Gospel came, was as much sharper, as the doctrine was clearer, than their foretaste of either.

¹ Rev. xiii. 13, 14.

To show you to what extent the early persecutions went, I will read you part of an account of one of them in the south of France; and, as I read it, would have you bear in mind the declaration in the text, that there is some suffering still to come, to which none which has hitherto happened, is worthy to be compared, and therefore not even what I am now going to read. It is written by eye-witnesses.

"... The rage of the populace, governor, and soldiers, especially lighted on Sanctus, a deacon; on Maturus, a late convert; on Attalus, and on Blandina, a slave, through whom CHRIST showed that the things which are lowly esteemed among men, have high account with God. For when we were all in fear, and her own mistress was in agony for her, lest she should be unable to make even one bold confession, from the weakness of her body, Blandina was filled with such strength, that even those, who tortured her by turns, in every possible way, from morning till evening, were wearied and gave it up, confessing she had conquered them. And they wondered at her remaining still alive, her whole body being mangled and pierced in every part. But that blessed woman, like a brave combatant, renewed her strength in confessing; and it was to her a recovery, a rest, and a respite, to say, 'I am a Christian.' . . . Sanctus also endured exceedingly all the cruelties of men with a noble patience. . . . and to all questions would say nothing but 'I am a Christian.' When they had nothing left to do to him, they fastened red hot plates of brass on the tenderest parts of his body. But though his limbs were burning, he remained upright and unshrinking, steadfast in his confession, bathed and strengthened from heaven with that fountain of living water that springs from the well of CHRIST. But his body bore witness of what had been done to it, being one entire wound, and deprived of the external form of man."

After some days they were taken to the shows where the wild beasts were, and went through every torture again, as though they had suffered nothing before. Again they were scourged, forced into the iron chair (which was red hot), dragged about by the beasts, and so came to their end. "But Blandina

was hung up upon a cross, and placed to be devoured by the beasts that were turned in." Afterwards she was scourged; at last placed in a basket and thrown to a bull, and died under the tossings of the furious animal. But the account is far too long and minute, and too dreadful, to allow of my going through it. I give this merely as a specimen of the sufferings of the early Christians, from the malice of the devil.

Take again the sufferings which the Arian Vandals inflicted at a later time. Out of four hundred and sixty Bishops in Africa, they sent forty-six out of the country to an unhealthy place, and confined them to hard labour, and three hundred and two to different parts of Africa. After an interval of ten years, they banished two hundred and twenty more. At another time they tore above four thousand Christians, clergy and laity, from their homes, and marched them across the sands, till they died either of fatigue or ill usage. They lacerated others with scourges, burned them with hot iron, and cut off their limbs¹.

Hear how one of the early Fathers, just when the first persecution was ceasing, meditates on the prospect lying before the Church, looking earnestly at the events of his own day, in order to discover from them, if he could, whether the predicted evil was coming.

"There will be a time of affliction, such as never happened since there was a nation upon the earth till that time. The fearful monster, the great serpent, the unconquerable enemy of mankind, ready to devour. . . . The LORD knowing the greatness of the enemy, in mercy to the religious, says, 'Let those that are in Judæa flee to the mountains.' However, if any feel within him a strong heart to wrestle with Satan, let him remain (for I do not despair of the Church's strength of nerve), let him remain, and let him say, 'Who shall separate us from the love of CHRIST?' . . . Thanks to GOD, who limits the greatness of the affliction to a few days, for the elect's sake those days shall be cut short. Antichrist shall reign only three years and a half;" a time, times, and the dividing of time. . . . "Blessed surely he who then shall be a

¹ Gibbon, Hist. chap. 37.

martyr for CHRIST! I consider that the martyrs at that season will be greater than all martyrs; for the former ones wrestled with man only, but these, in the time of Antichrist, will battle with Satan himself personally. Persecuting emperors slaughtered the former; but they did not pretend to raise the dead, nor made show of signs and wonders: but here there will be the persuasion both of force and of fraud, so as to deceive, if possible, even the elect. Let no one at that day say in his heart, 'What could CHRIST do more than *this*? by what virtue worketh he these things? Unless God willed it, He would not have permitted it.' No: the Apostle forewarns you, saying beforehand, 'God shall send them a strong delusion,'—not that they may be excused, but condemned; those, viz. who believe not in the Truth, that is, the true CHRIST, but take pleasure in unrighteousness, that is, in Antichrist. . . . Prepare thyself, therefore, O man! thou hearest the signs of Antichrist; nor remind only thyself of them, but communicate them liberally to all around thee. If thou hast a child according to the flesh, delay not to instruct him. If thou art a teacher, prepare also thy spiritual children, lest they take the false for the True. For 'the mystery of iniquity doth already work.' I fear the wars of the nations; I fear the divisions among Christians; I fear the hatred among brethren. Enough; but God forbid that it should be fulfilled in our day. However, let us be prepared¹."

To these observations I will add only two remarks: first, that it is quite certain, that if such a persecution has been foretold, it has not yet come, and therefore is to come. We may be wrong in thinking that Scripture foretels it, though it has been the common belief, I may say, of all ages; but if there be, it is still future. So that every generation of Christians should be on the watch-tower, looking out,—nay, the more and more, as time goes on.

Next, I observe that signs do occur from time to time, not to enable us to fix the day, for that is hidden, but to show us it is coming. The world grows old—the earth is crumbling

¹ Cyr. Catech. xv. 16, 17.

away—the night is far spent—the day is at hand. The shadows begin to move—the old forms of empire which have lasted ever since CHRIST was with us, heave and tremble before our eyes, and nod to their fall. They are they which keep CHRIST from us—He is behind them. When they go, Antichrist will be released from that which letteth, and after his short but fearful season CHRIST will come.

For instance : one sign is the present state of the Roman Empire, if it may be said to exist, though it does exist ; but it is like a man on his death-bed, who after many throes and pangs, at last goes off when you least expect, or perhaps you know not when. You watch the sick man, and you say every day will be the last ; yet day after day goes on—you know not when the end will come—he lingers on—gets better—relapses,—yet you are sure after all he must die—it is a mere matter of time, you call it a matter of time : so is it with the old Roman Empire, which now lies so still and helpless. It is not dead, but it is on its death-bed. We suppose indeed that it will not die without some violence even yet, without convulsions. Antichrist is to head it ; yet in another sense it dies to make way for Antichrist, and this latter form of death is surely hastening on, whether it comes a few years sooner or later. It may outlast our time, and the time of our children ; for we are creatures of a day, and a generation is like the striking of a clock ; but it tends to dissolution, and its hours are numbered.

Again, another anxious sign at the present time is what appears in the approaching destruction of the Mahometan power. This too may outlive our day ; still it tends visibly to annihilation, and as it crumbles, perchance the sands of the world's life are running out.

And lastly, not to mention many other tokens which might be observed upon, here is this remarkable one. In one of the passages I just now read from the book of Revelations, it is said that in the last times, and in order to the last persecution, Satan, being loosed from his prison, shall deceive the nations in the extremities of the earth, Gog and Magog, and bring them to battle against the Church. These words had been already used

by the prophet Ezekiel, who borrows the latter of them from the tenth chapter of Genesis. We read in that chapter that after the flood the sons of Japheth were Gomer, and Magog, and Madan, and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras." Magog is supposed to be the ancestor of the nations in the north, the Tartars or Scythians. Whatever then Gog means, which is not known, here is a prophecy that the northern nations should be stirred up against the Church, and be one of the instruments of its suffering. And it is to be observed that twice since that prophecy was delivered, the northern nations have invaded the Church, and both times they have brought with them, or rather (as the text in the Revelations expresses it) they have been deceived into an Antichristian delusion,—been deceived into it, not invented it. The first irruption was that of the Goths and Vandals in the early times of the Church, and they were deceived into and fought for the Arian heresy. The next was that of the Turks, and they in like manner were deceived into and fought for Mahomedanism. Here then history since, as in other instances, is in part a comment upon the prophecy. Now, I do not mean that as to the present time, we see how this is to be accomplished in its fulness, after the pattern of the Shadows which have gone before. But thus much we see—we see that in matter of fact the nations of the North are gathering strength, and beginning to frown over the seat of the Roman Empire as they never have done since the time when the Turks came down. Here then we have a *sign* of Antichrist's appearance—I do not say of his instant coming, or his certain coming, for it may after all be but a type or shadow: still, so far as it goes, it is a preparation, a warning, a call to sober thought—just as a cloud in the sky (to use our Lord's instance) warns us about the weather. It is no sure proof of what is to be, but we think it prudent to keep our eye upon it.

This is what I have to say about the last persecution and its signs. And surely it is profitable to think about it, though we be quite mistaken in the detail. For instance, after all it may not be a persecution of blood and death, but of craft and sub-

tilty only—not of miracles, but of natural wonders and powers of human skill, human acquirements in the hands of the devil. Satan may adopt the more alarming weapons of deceit—he may hide himself—he may attempt to seduce us in little things, and so to move the Church, not all at once, but by little and little from her true position. I do believe he has done much in this way in the course of the last few centuries. I believe he has moved every part of the Church, this way or that way, but some way or other from the truth as it is in Jesus, from the old faith on which it was built “before the division of the east and west¹.” It is his policy to split us up and divide us, to dislodge us gradually from off our rock of strength. And if there is to be a persecution, perhaps it will be then; then, perhaps, when we are all of us in all parts of Christendom so divided, and so reduced, so full of schism, so close upon heresy. When we have cast ourselves upon the world and depend for protection upon it, and have given up our independence and our strength, then he may burst upon us in fury as far as God allows him. Then suddenly the Roman Empire may break up, and Antichrist appear as a persecutor, and the barbarous nations around break in. But all these things are in God’s hand and God’s knowledge, and there let us leave them.

This alone, I will say, in conclusion, as I have already said several times, that such meditations as these may be turned to good account. What a curb upon our self-willed, selfish hearts, to believe that a persecution is in store for the Church, whether or not it comes in our days! Surely with this thought before us, we cannot bear to give ourselves up to thoughts of ease and comfort, of making money, settling well, or rising in the world. Surely with this thought before us, we cannot but feel that we are, what all Christians really are in the best estate, (nay rather would wish to be had they their will, if they be Christians in heart) *pilgrims*, watchers waiting for the morning, waiting for the light, eagerly straining our eyes for the first dawn of day—looking out

¹ Vide Bishop Kenn’s will.

for our SAVIOUR's coming, His glorious advent, when He will end the reign of sin and wickedness, accomplish the number of His elect, and perfect those who at present struggle with infirmity, yet in their hearts love and obey Him.

May He perform all this in His own good time, according to His infinite mercies! May He give us strength according to our days, and peace at the last!

NOTE.

The following passage from Bishop Horaley's Letters, published in the British Magazine for 1834, is very remarkable, considering it was written nearly forty years since. It is here quoted as bearing on the subject of the foregoing Sermons.

"The Church of GOD on earth will be greatly reduced, as we may well imagine, in its apparent numbers, in the times of Antichrist, by the open desertion of the powers of the world. This desertion will begin in a professed indifference to any particular form of Christianity, under the pretence of universal toleration; which toleration will proceed from no true spirit of charity and forbearance, but from a design to undermine Christianity, by multiplying and encouraging sectaries. The pretended toleration will go far beyond a just toleration, even as it regards the different sects of Christians. For governments will pretend an indifference to all, and will give a protection in preference to none. All establishments will be laid aside. From the toleration of the most pestilent heresies, they will proceed to the toleration of Mahometanism, Atheism, and at last to a positive persecution of the truth of Christianity. In these times the Temple of GOD will be reduced almost to the Holy Place, that is, to the small number of real Christians who worship the FATHER in spirit and in truth, and regulate their doctrine and their worship, and their whole conduct, strictly by the word of GOD. The merely nominal Christians will all desert the profession of the truth, when the powers of the world desert it. And this tragical event I take to be typified by the order to St. John to measure the Temple and the Altar, and leave the outer court (national Churches) to be trodden under foot by the Gentiles. The property of the clergy will be pillaged, the public worship insulted and vilified by these deserters of the faith they once professed, who are not called apostates, because they never were in earnest in their profession. Their profession was nothing more than a compliance with fashion and public authority. In principle they were always, what they now appear to be, Gentiles. When this general desertion of the faith takes place, then will commence the sackcloth ministry of the witnesses.... There will be nothing of splendour in the external appearance

of these Churches; they will have no support from governments, no honours, no emoluments, no immunities, no authority, but that which no earthly power can take away, which they derive from Him who commissioned them to be His witnesses." B. M. vol. v. p. 520.

There are reasons, not necessary here to mention, for adding, that these Sermons were written several years since.

OXFORD,
The Feast of St. Peter.
1838.

*These Tracts are published Quarterly, and sold at the price of
2d. for each sheet, or 7s. for 50 copies.*

LONDON: PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.
1838.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

The following Works, all in single volumes, or pamphlets, and recently published, will be found more or less to uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in these Tracts :—

Bp. Taylor on Repentance, by Hale.—*Rivingtons.*

Bp. Taylor's Golden Grove.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, with translation.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Pusey on Cathedrals and Clerical Education.—*Roake & Varty.*

Hook's University Sermons.—*Talboys, Oxford.*

Pusey on Baptism (*published separately*).—*Rivingtons.*

Newman's Sermons, 3 vols.—*Rivingtons.*

Newman on Romanism, &c.—*Rivingtons.*

The Christian Year.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Lyra Apostolica.—*Rivingtons.*

Perceval on the Roman Schism.—*Leslie.*

Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions.—*Duncan.*

Dodsworth's Lectures on the Church.—*Burns.*

Newman on Suffragan Bishops.—*Rivingtons.*

Keble's Sermon on Tradition.—*Rivingtons.*

Memoir of Ambrose Bonwick.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer.—*Rivingtons.*

Law's first and second Letters to Hoadly.—*Rivingtons.*

Bp. Andrews' Devotions. Latin and Greek.—*Pickering.*

Hook's Family Prayers.—*Rivingtons.*

Herbert's Poems and Country Pastor.

Evans's Scripture Biography.—*Rivingtons.*

Le Bas' Life of Archbishop Laud.—*Rivingtons.*

Jones (of Nayland) on the Church.

Bp. Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration.—*Rivingtons.*

Bp. Beveridge's Sermons on the Ministry and Ordinances.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Bp. Jolly on the Eucharist.

Fulford's Sermons on the Ministry, &c.—*Rivingtons.*

Rose's Sermons on the Ministry.—*Rivingtons*.
A Catechism on the Church.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Russell's Judgment of the Anglican Church.—*Baily*.
Poole's Sermons on the Creed.—*Grant, Edinburgh*.
Sutton on the Eucharist.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Leslie on the Regale and Pontificate.—*Leslie*.
Pusey's Sermon on November 5.—*Rivingtons*.

Larger Works which may be profitably studied.

Bishop Bull's Sermons.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Bishop Bull's Works.—*University Press*.
Waterland's Works.—*Do*.
Wall on Infant Baptism.—*Do*.
Pearson on the Creed.—*Do*.
Leslie's Works.—*Do*.
Bingham's Works.—*Straker, London*.
Palmer on the Liturgy.—*University Press*.
Palmer on the Church.—*Rivingtons*.
Hooker, ed. Keble.—*Do*.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

WHETHER A CLERGYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BE
NOW BOUND TO HAVE MORNING AND EVENING PRAYERS
DAILY IN HIS PARISH CHURCH?

COLLECTIONS IN ORDER TO THE RESOLUTION OF THIS QUESTION.

1. BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. — “They (the Fathers) so ordered the matter, that all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once every year; intending thereby, that the clergy, and especially such as were ministers in the congregation, should (by often reading and meditation in God’s word) be stirred up to godliness themselves, and be more able to exhort others by wholesome doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries to the truth; and further, that the people (by daily hearing of the Holy Scripture read in the Church) might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of His true religion.”—*Concerning the Service of the Church.*

2. “All priests and deacons are to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer, either privately or openly, not being let by sickness, or some other urgent cause. And the curate that ministereth in every parish-church or chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the parish-church or chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God’s word, and to pray with him.”—*Ibid.*

[Note, that these last directions used to be inclosed in inverted commas, probably for the purpose of calling peculiar attention. It might be asked, on what authority the commas have been omitted in recent editions of the Prayer Book?]

3. "The Psalter shall be read through once every month, as it is there appointed, both for Morning and Evening Prayer."—*Order how the Psalter is appointed to be read.*

4. "The Old Testament is appointed for the first Lessons at Morning and Evening Prayer, so as the most part thereof will be read over every year once. The New Testament is appointed for the second Lessons at Morning and Evening Prayer, and shall be read over orderly every year thrice."—*Order how the rest of Holy Scripture is appointed to be read.*

5. **TITLE.**—"The Order for Morning and Evening Prayer *daily* to be said and used throughout the year."

6. **TE DEUM.**—"Day by day we magnify thee. . . .

"Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep us *this day* without sin."

7. **RUBRIC.**—"The Collects [for Peace and for Grace] shall never alter, but *daily* be said at Morning Prayer throughout all the year." See also the Collect for Grace.

See likewise the Rubric before the Second Collect at Evening Prayer, and the Collect for Aid against all Perils.

The Collect for the First Sunday in Advent is to be repeated *every day*, until Christmas Eve.

That for Ash-Wednesday is to be read *every day* in Lent, after the Collect appointed for *the day*.

The Morning and Evening Service to be used *daily* at Sea, shall be the same which is appointed in the Book of Common Prayer.

8. In the Prayer-book of 1552, instead of "not being let by sickness," &c. (see No. 2.) we have, "except they be letted by preaching, studying of divinity, or some other," &c.

9. **Q. ELIZABETH'S INJUNCTIONS, 1559.**—"Item, That weekly upon Wednesdays and Fridays, not being holy-days, the curate at the accustomed hours of service shall resort to church, and cause warning to be given to the people by knolling of a bell, and say the Litany and Prayers."—Injunction 48th. *Bishop Sparrow's Coll.* p. 79.

10. **CANON XIV. JAMES I.**—"The Common Prayer shall be said or sung distinctly and reverently upon such days as are appointed to be kept holy by the Book of Common Prayer, and

their eves, and at convenient and usual times of those days, and in such place of every church as the bishop of the diocese, or ecclesiastical ordinary of the place shall think meet for the largeness or straitness of the same, so as the people may be most edified. All ministers likewise shall observe the orders, rites, and ceremonies, prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, as well in reading the Holy Scriptures, and saying of prayers, as in administration of the Sacraments, without either diminishing in regard of preaching, or in any other respect, or adding any thing in the matter or form thereof."

11. CANON XV.—"The Litany shall be said or sung when, and as it is set down in the Book of Common Prayer, by the parsons, vicars, ministers, or curates, in all cathedral, collegiate or parish churches and chapels, in some convenient place, according to the discretion of the bishop of the diocese, or ecclesiastical ordinary of the place. And that we may speak more particularly, upon Wednesdays and Fridays weekly¹, though they be not holydays, the minister at the accustomed hours of service shall resort to the church and chapel, and warning being given to the people by tolling of a bell, shall say the Litany prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer: whereunto we wish every householder dwelling within half a mile of the church to come, or send one at the least of his household fit to join with the minister in prayers."

12. After the words "some urgent cause," (see No. 2.) the Scotch Prayer-book had, "Of which cause, if it be frequently pretended, they are to make the bishop of the diocese, or the archbishop of the province, the judge and allowers."

13. TITLE OF THE LITANY.—"Here followeth the Litany to be used after the third collect at Morning Prayer, called the Collect for Grace, upon Sundayes, Wednesdayes and Fridayes, and at other times when it shall be commanded by the ordinarie, and without omission of any part of the other daily service of the Church on those days."—*Prayer-book of the Church of Scotland*, 1637.

¹ Socrat. Hist. l. v. c. 22. S. Basil. Tom. 3. Epist. 289. (93. Ed. B.)

14. PRAYER IN EMBER WEEKS.—“A Prayer to be said in the Ember weeks, for those which are then to be admitted into holy orders; and is to be read every day of the week, beginning on the Sunday before the day of ordination.”—*Prayer-book of the Church of Scotland*.

15. ACT OF UNIFORMITY, 14 C. 2. cap. iv. § 2.—“Be it enacted by the King’s most excellent Majesty, &c., That all and singular ministers in any cathedral, collegiate or parish church or chapel, or other place of public worship within this realm of England, dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, shall be bound to say and use the Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, celebration and administration of both the Sacraments, and all other the publick and common prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said book, annexed and joined to this present act, and intituled, ‘The Book of Common Prayer,’ &c.: and that the Morning and Evening Prayers therein contained, shall upon every Lord’s Day, and upon all other days and occasions, and at the times therein appointed, be openly and solemnly read by all and every minister or curate in every church, chapel or other place of public worship within this realm of England, and places aforesaid.”

16. DR. NICHOLLS.—“Morning and Evening Prayer shall be used, and all other the Common Prayer, administration, &c. in the order and form, and on the days, and times appointed, nor will any dispensation excuse the performance of what is here required.”—*Dr. Nicholls on the Act of Uniformity*.

17. “The Rubric here (see No. 2.) speaks of the whole Morning and Evening Prayer, which our Reformers would not have in any case, neglected by ministers of the Church; but that they should be as diligent, in using the English Liturgy, as the Papists were the Latin; and if they could not get a congregation at church, they should use the public forms with their own families at home.

“Now, it is certain, by the rules of the Roman Church, even before the Reformation, and the Council of Trent, that the clergy were obliged to recite the canonical hours, or the offices

of the several hours of day and night, which are in the Breviary ; either publicly in a church or chapel, or privately by themselves. The canon law is positive as to this, with relation to priests. Decret. dis. 91. And it is the common opinion of the divines and canonists, that deacons and sub-deacons were obliged to the same. Wherefore, since our Reformers thought it convenient that the mumbling over the prayers in private should be laid aside by the clergy, they would not perfectly exonerate them from the constant repetition of the public devotions ; and therefore they changed the private recital of the Morning and Evening service, which was before performed by each clergyman alone by himself, into family prayer, when a congregation could not be gotten at Church."—*Dr. Nicholls in locum.*

18. "The two times of worshipping God in public among the Jews, were Morning and Evening, and that by God's own appointment ; the Morning and Evening Sacrifice drawing the people together for that purpose. 'Thou shalt offer upon the altar two lambs of the first year : the one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning, and the other in the evening.' (Exod. xxix. 32.) Which precept was constantly observed, as long as the city and polity of the Jews stood. For Josephus says, Δις τῆς ἡμέρας, πρῶτῃ τε καὶ περὶ ἐννάτην ὥραν, ἱερουργούντων ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ. 'Twice a day, in the morning and at the ninth hour, they offer sacrifice.' Joseph. Ant. lib. xiv. c. 4. And that this was the hour of prayer, for devout people to go to the temple, to perform their devotions there, is plain from Acts iii. 1. 'Peter and John went up together into the temple, being the ninth hour,' which is confirmed by the Talmud. R.-Jose Ben Chaninah saith, 'The patriarchs appointed the prayers.' R. Josua Ben Levi saith, 'They appointed them according to the daily sacrifices. Morning Prayer is till the fourth hour ; the prayer of the Mincha, or the Evening, is till evening.'"—*Beracoth, cited by Dr. Lightfoot, Talm. Ex. p. 649.*

"Upon this account, the primitive Christians, who would not be behind-hand with the Jews in their devotion, did constantly observe these two solemn times of prayer, and did very early

add a third. For, as some devout Jews had a third hour, which they devoted to prayer, viz. (our twelve o'clock) when they retired to some closet, or other private place, to say their prayers, as we see in the example of Peter, who went up on the house-top to pray about the sixth hour (Acts x. 9.): so the primitive Christians turned this hour, which was formerly voluntary, into a settled hour of public devotion. For so it was settled before St. Cyprian's time; for this Father gives a rationale of the institution of the three solemn hours of prayer. The Morning Prayer (he says) was instituted in remembrance of CHRIST's resurrection; the Noon Prayer in remembrance of His crucifixion, and the Evening prayer in token of His death, (Vide Cyp. de Or. Dom.) which is confirmed likewise by a passage in St. Clemens of Alexandria, Εἰ τινες καὶ ὥρας τάκτας ἀπονέμουσιν εὐχῇ, ὥς τρίτην, φέρε, καὶ ἕκτην, καὶ ἑννάτην, &c. "Though some are for stated hours of prayer, viz. 9, 12, and 3 o'clock; yet the ὁ γνωστικός, the most perfect Christian, will be always praying." (Clem. Alex. Strom. vii.) Soon after, the monks, who would be more devout than common Christians, were for more hours of stated prayer: and in St. Basil's time, they had mounted them up to seven. (Op. tom. ii. p. 479.) At last these were established by decree of Pope Pelagius II., and the Psalms appointed for each hour, which was the rise of what they call canonical hours in the Church of Rome. (Pol. Virg. de Rer. Inv. lib. ii. c. 2.) But our Church, in her reformation, has brought back the solemn times of prayer to the most ancient institution, and enjoined only morning and evening prayer to be used."—*Dr. Nicholls' note on "Proper Lessons for Sundays."*

19. Day by day, &c. (see No. 6.) "Therefore in the words of the Psalmist let us say, 'Every day do we bless thee, and praise thy name for ever and ever,' be pleased therefore to answer the petitions of this day's devotion, and to preserve us from sin, till the course of our public exercise returns to-morrow."—*Dr. Nicholls, Paraphrase on the Te Deum.*

20. CREED.—"St. Ambrose (Ad Virg. lib. iii.) advises the use of the Creed every morning. And St. Austin (De Symb. ad

Cat. lib. i.) morning and night. King Canutus ordered it to be used in our daily devotions."—*Id. Notes on the Apostles' Creed.* [But see No. 26. of this Collection.]

21. "The latter part of the Collect for Grace (see No. 7.) does exactly agree with that in the Greek Liturgies: Δωρῆσαι ἡμῖν τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς παρουσίας ἡμέρας, εἰρηκὸν καὶ ἀναμάρτητον, καὶ πάντα τὸν χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν. Euchol. Gr. Lucern. Orat. 2."—*Id. Note on the Collect for Grace.*

22. "And we beseech thee, out of thy tender mercy to all thy creatures, and especially to thy faithful servants, that thou wouldest be pleased to defend us from all the dangers which the night brings along with it; from fire and thieves; from diseases and sudden death; from all unchaste thoughts and frightful dreams; and that thou wouldest preserve us in health and safety to the next morning."—*Id. Paraph. on the third Collect at Evening Prayer.*

23. BISHOP OVERALL.—Of ministers daily saying the service.—This was so ordered in the Council of Venice, under Pope Leo I., and after that in the Council of Mentz, Can. 57. "Clericus, quem intra muros civitatis sue manere constiterit, et matutinis hymnis, sine probabili excusatione ægritudinis, inventus fuerit defuisse, septem diebus a communione habeatur extraneus," &c.—*Bishop Overall ap. Nickolls.*

24. "All the priests and deacons shall be bound to say daily."—"So that we are all bound, and all priests are in the Church of Rome, daily to repeat and say the public service of the Church. And it is a precept the most useful and necessary of any other that belongs to the ministers of God, and such as have cure of other men's souls, would men regard it, and practise it a little more than they do among us. We are all for preaching now; and for attending the service and prayers appointed by the Church for God's worship, and the good of all men, we think that too mean an office for us, and therefore, as if it were not worth our labour, we commonly hire others under us to do it, more to satisfy the law, than to be answerable to our duties. Here is a command that binds us every day to say the Morning and Evening Prayer; How many are the men that are noted

to do it? It is well they have a back-door for an excuse to come out at here: for good men! they are so belaboured with studying of divinity, and preaching the word, that they have no leisure to read these same common prayers; as if this were not a chief part of their office and charge committed unto them. Certainly, the people whose souls they have care of, reap as great benefit, and more too, by these prayers, which their pastors are daily to make unto God for them, either privately or publicly, as they can do by their preaching: for God is more respective to the prayers which they make for the people, than ever the people are to the sermons which they make to them.”—*Id. ibid.* p. 6.

25. BISHOP COSINS.—“Every curate is enjoined to say the Morning and Evening Prayer daily in the Church, unless he be otherwise reasonably letted. Which requires an explanation (against them that account themselves ‘reasonably letted’ by any common and ordinary affairs of their own) whether any thing but sickness, or necessary absence abroad, shall be sufficient to excuse them from this duty.”—*Bishop Cosins ap. Nicholls*, 67.

26. It does not appear, (see No. 20.) from the Latin version at least, that Canute ordered the Creed to be used in the daily devotions.—*See Sir H. Spelman's Councils, &c.* vol. i. p. 549.

27. SAXON CHURCH.—Excerptio 2^{da} Egberti Archiep. Ebor. circ. An. Christi 750.

“Item, Ut omnes sacerdotes, horis competentibus diei et noctis, suarum sonent ecclesiarum signa: et sacra tunc Deo celebrent officia; et populos erudiant, quomodo aut quibus Deus adorandus est horis.”—*Spelm. Conc.* 1. p. 259.

Ex ejusdem Egberti Pœnitentialis Lib. 2^{do};

5. “Si quis clericus aut monachus corporis sanitate consistens, si vigiliis et cotidianis officiis defuerit, perdat communionem.”

6. “Si quis clericus, absque corpusculi sui inæqualitate, vigiliis deest, stipendio privatus, excommunicetur.”

7. “Si quis clericus, dato signo, non statim ad ecclesiam properaverit, correctionibus subiacebit.”—*Spelman, Conc.* vol. i. p. 276.

28. "Docemus etiam, ut quis statis temporibus campanas pulset, et ut omnis tunc sacerdos cantum suum horarium in ecclesia psallat, Deum in timore invocet sollicite, et pro omni populo preces fundat."—*Canon. dat. sub Edg. Reg. Spelm. i. p. 453.*

29. "De mane et vespere orando.

"Dicendum illis ut singulis diebus, qui amplius non potest, saltem duabus vicibus oret; mane scilicet et vespere, dicens symbolum sive Orationem Dominicam; Qui plasmasti me miserere mei; vel etiam, Deus propitius esto mihi peccatori. Et Domino gratias agens pro quotidianæ vitæ comitatibus, et quia se ad imaginem suam creare dignatus sit, et a peccatoribus segregare; his actis, et solo Deo Creatore suo adorato sanctos invocet, ut pro se intercedere ad majestatem divinam dignentur; hæc facient quibus basilicæ locus prope est in basilica. Qui vero in itinere, aut pro qualibet occasione in sylvis aut in agris est, ubicunque enim hora matutina vel vespertina invenerit, sic faciat, sciens Deum ubique præsentem esse, dicente Psalmista, "In omni loco dominationis ejus, et si ascendero in cælum, tu ibi es," &c.—*Spelm. Conc. 23^{ta} Capit. incert. Edit. vol. i. p. 599.*

30. DR. BISSE.—"Though the publick worship be appointed to be daily offered up in our parish churches, and in some few is offered up according to appointment; yet in these great temples (Cathedrals) the morning and evening sacrifice is never intermitted: it is offered day by day continually, even as the Lamb under the law. These are the great mother churches in every diocese, from which the parochial churches being originally derived, and upon which being dependent, are to be looked upon as parts of them, and belonging to them, as living members of the same body; and therefore the acts and offerings which are offered up in these greater, are accepted for all the lesser parish churches within their dependence, where the daily offering is not upon just cause observed, as indeed it generally cannot; even as the daily sacrifice of the temple was imputed to the several synagogues, where only the law and the prophets were expounded, and that every Sabbath-day. These cathedral temples, these mother-churches, the sure resting-places for the ark of the covenant, before which the daily offering never ceaseth to be

offered morning and evening,—these are our strength and salvation, and are of far greater use and security to our people and to our land, than all the watchfulness of our senators, or policy of our ambassadors, or valour of our mighty men."—*Dr. Bisse, Rationale on Cathedral Worship*, pp. 53, 54.

31. T. S.—"the corruptions and cruelties of the Church of Rome, made those that justly opposed her in many things, to forsake others, without any other reason but the hatred of being like to her who had been so cruel towards them. And among these, I reckon this to be the chief, that they not only left off the *daily* offices of God's publick worship, but also that *ancient order* for the performance thereof on the Lord's day, which was most accommodate," &c.—*Preface to a book intituled "Advice to the Readers of the Common Prayer, &c., by T. S. [possibly, Dr. Thomas Smith, the friend of Bishop Ken.] 1683."*

32. "Hereby (by the use of our Liturgy) we shall be greatly assisted in holy meditations (while our minds will be stored with abundance of excellent matter for the same), and in educating our children religiously, in keeping our families in unity and order, and performing the worship belonging to the same, and many other great benefits that we shall experience in a devout attendance on the daily service of God in publick appointed by this Church; by which means they will also be more confirmed in their love hereunto, and become examples to others, who will be more effectually drawn to their duty, by observing the practice of this way of piety, than by disputations about it."—*Ibid. sub fn.*

33. "I was lately told of an order in some Lutheran churches, whose service consists chiefly in singing the Psalms of David to the praise and glory of God, and songs of love and honour to our blessed SAVIOUR, composed by excellent persons among themselves: they have twice a day assemblies for this service; and that all may know what is to be sung, there is a table hung up at the entrance of the church, where it is written down what Psalms and Songs are appointed for the day; and the people (coming early to church) go first to this place, and take

notice what they are to sing, and look it out ready before the service begins."—*Advice to Readers, &c.* p. 80.

34. "Whereas we have an order most profitable and comfortable to pious minds, (viz. to have publick prayers daily, that those who are not hindered by necessary provisions for themselves and family, or other works of justice and mercy, may constantly enjoy the heavenly delights of God's house, in Christian communion and fellowship of the Spirit (which certainly are above any can be found elsewhere) and for a freedom whereunto a plentiful estate is more desirable than upon any other account whatsoever); yet notwithstanding this, many of the richest and most leisurly persons never take care that this order be observed in their own parish churches; and when it is, will scarce ever come there, but make that which should give them the greatest advantage and obligation to come, to be a hindrance thereunto: I mean that men make use of their riches to run themselves into such vast trades and troublesome projects, whereby they are so incumbered with cares and labours, that they are less at leisure for God's service than the poor and indigent; or else (if they incline more to pleasure than profit) they take no care to order their carnal divertisements, that they may be no hindrance to the service of God; but make them more joyful and zealous therein (though this they ought to do), but suffer these to ingross all their time and exhaust all the vigor and strength of their minds, that either they never come to church at all (at least on week-days), or if they do, they are more ready to sleep than pray, and are far from taking such delight in these spiritual exercises as they find in carnal recreations: nay, many I have observed that will stand altogether idle and unemployed (a thing that seems tedious to nature itself), and yet will not divert themselves with going to church; and in this I have observed the female sex most guilty, who being not so subject to be incumbered with business as men, and often wanting opportunity of company, sports, and pastimes, have nothing else to do; and yet living near the churches where prayers are daily read, seldom or never come there."—*Advice to the Readers, &c.* pp. 132, 133.

35. "That the Church hath well appointed these daily offices

of divine worship, it being agreeable to reason and the divine prescription to the Jews, and the customs of the wisest and most civilized of the Gentiles;—this, and much more that might be said of like nature, being so evident, I must believe those kind of men, that think our daily attendance at prayers is being righteous over-much, are not moved hereunto by any thing of reason or sober consideration; but are wholly influenced by pride or covetousness, or other carnal affections which hinder the exercise of their rational faculties, &c. The second sort to whom I shall apply myself, and for whose sake I chiefly undertook this work, is such as have a love for these holy offices, and daily frequent them; to whom my earnest request is, that they will persist in the good way they have begun, attend to the best manner of performance, and make all the rest of their lives answer to the devotion herein. For the first of these, I doubt not but such who do understand the grounds and reasons upon which this way of our publick service was first ordered, and have taken up this practice, not upon some carnal and secular accounts (as may sometimes happen), but in a sense of their duty to God and man: I say, these will, I hope, easily and effectually comply with my desire, and save me the labour of arguments. The inward peace and satisfaction they will find in governing themselves in this matter by reason and not by fancy, and in following the universal custom and usage of Christians for many ages, and of most even in this, and not that of heretiques and schismatiques; in obeying the orders of our own Church, made with the greatest advice and by the most unbiassed persons of any in the world; and not herding with Quakers, Fifth-monarchy-men, Anabaptists, and other turbulent sects that oppose the same and seek its ruin; in finding all that was good and profitable, all that was decent and solemn, all that was truly primitive or any way praiseworthy in the service of the Church of Rome, still retained in ours, &c. I say, the satisfaction they will find in considering the excellency of our Form of divine service will prevent all inclination to turn into other ways."—*Advice to the Readers*, &c. p. 138. 141.

36. "I do heartily congratulate the happy success of such ministers, who in conscience of their assent and consent to the

orders of this Church, have taken upon them the constant daily reading of the Common Prayer in their parish churches. that do not make the backwardness of their people to come to prayers a pretence for their own neglect (when they never tried how forward they would be if they had opportunity and good instruction). they have found success beyond their expectation, the numbers of those that have attended the prayers being much greater than what others do ordinarily suggest to be likely," &c.

"DAILY PRAYERS IN AND ABOUT THE CITY (1683).

	Mor.	Ev.		Mor.	Ev.
King's Chapel,	6 & 10	4	Tabernacle - - -	9	3
Duke's Chapel,			St. Paul's, Covent		
Westminster Abbey,			Garden - - -	10	3
Ely House,			St. Martin's, Ludgate	9	3
Temple,			St. Dion. Back Ch. -	8	5
Lincoln's Inne,	8	4	St. Andrew Undershaft,		
Grey's Inne,			Old Fish Street -	—	6
St. James, Clerkenwell,	10		St. Antholin's, }		
Charter House - - -	11	4	St. Sepulchre's, }	—	6
St. Christopher's - -	6	6	St. Mary Woolnoth -	11	—
St. Martin's Church -	6	5			

"At St. — Aldermanbury, at 11 Morn. and 5 Even. Being given by a pious person for one year, with promise of settling it for ever, if it be attended by any considerable number in that time. 'Tis a thousand pities future generations should be hindered of such a benefit by the indevotion of this."—*Advice to the Readers*, &c. pp. 115. 168.

37. **BP. JEREMY TAYLOR.**—"Between this (morning) and noon usually are said the publick prayers appointed by authority, to which all the clergy are obliged, and other devout persons that have leisure to accompany them."—*Bp. Jeremy Taylor, Holy Living*, p. 39.

38. **BP. FELL.**—" If I require a constant diligence in offering the daily sacrifice of prayer for the people at least at those returns which the Church enjoins, the usual answer is, they are ready to do their duty, but the people will not be prevailed with to join with them. And so when the minister has thoroughly accused his flock, he thinks he has absolved himself, his church becomes a sinecure; and because others forbear to do

their duty, there remains none for him to do. But, my brethrenif our people be negligent, we are the more obliged to industry; if they are indevout, we ought to be more zealous; if they are licentious, we ought to be more exemplary. Nor let any man say, the people will not be prevailed upon: how know we what will be hereafter? They who resisted one attempt may yield unto another; or if they yield not to a single instance, they may to many and more pressing," &c.—*From Bishop Fell's Charge to his Clergy*, 1685.

39. ROBERT NELSON.—“ Q. Is the obligation [of attending publick worship] sufficiently discharged by going to church on Sundays and holy days?

A. “ It is to be wisht, that all Christians were constant in attending the publick worship on Sundays and holy days; because 'tis likely 'twould dispose them to repeat such exercises of devotion with greater frequency. But considering that among the Jews there was a morning and evening sacrifice daily offered to God at the Temple; and that the precepts of the Gospel oblige us to ‘ pray always,’ and to ‘ pray without ceasing;’ and that the ancient prophets expressly declare that there should be as frequent devotion in the days of CHRIST, as there had been in former times; that ‘ prayer shall be made unto Him continually, and daily shall He be praised.’ Considering these things, I say, as prayer, the Christian sacrifice should be offered morning and evening in public assemblies; so they that have such opportunities, and are not lawfully hindered, should endeavour so to regulate their time, as to be able constantly to attend such a great advantage to the Christian life. And as those who have leisure cannot better employ it, so they must have but little concern for the honour and glory of God, that neglect such opportunities of declaring and publishing His praise.”—*Nelson's Fasts*, p. 440, 3d edit. 1705.

40. BISHOP BURNET.—“ Though there is still much ignorance among their [the Roman] mass priests; yet their parish priests are generally another sort of men: they are well instructed in their religion; lead regular lives, and perform their parochial duties with a most wonderful diligence. They do not only say

mass, and the other publick functions daily, but they are almost perpetually employing themselves in the several parts of their cures: instructing the youth, hearing confessions, and visiting the sick: and besides all this, they are under the constant obligation of the breviary."—*Bishop Burnet, Pref. to his Disc. on Past. Care.*

41. HOMILY.—"To the house or temple of God, at all times by common order appointed, are all people that be godly indeed, bound with all diligence to resort, unless by sickness or other most urgent causes they be letted therefro. . . . If we would compare our negligence in resorting to the house of the Lord there to serve Him, with the diligence of the Jews in coming daily very early, sometime by great journeys to their temple, and when the multitude could not be received within the Temple, the fervent zeal that they had, declared in standing long without and praying: we may justly in this comparison condemn our slothfulness and negligence, yea plain contempt, in coming to the Lord's house standing so near unto us, so seldom and scarcely at any time."—*First Part of the Homily "Of the right Use of the Church."*

42. DR. CAVE.—"The Christian Churches began to rise apace, according as they met with more quiet and favourable times; especially under Valerian, Gallienus, Claudius, Aurelian, and some other emperors: of which times Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. l. 8. c. 1. p. 292.) tells us, that the bishops met with the highest respect and kindness both from people and governors. And adds: But who shall be able to reckon up the innumerable multitudes that daily flocked to the faith of CHRIST, the number of congregations in every city?" &c.—*Dr. Cave's Primit. Christianity*, part i. 6.

43. "As that day [the Jewish Sabbath] was kept as a commemoration of God's Sabbath, or resting from the work of creation, so was this set apart for religious uses, as the solemn memorial of CHRIST's resting from the work of our redemption in this world, completed upon the day of His resurrection. Which brings into my mind that custom of theirs, so universally common in those days, that whereas at other times they kneeled at

prayers, on the Lord's day they always prayed standing, as is expressly affirmed both by Justin Martyr (Ap. 2. p. 98.) and Tertullian (De Coron. c. 3. p. 102.): the reason of which we find in the author of the Questions and Answers in Justin Martyr (Resp. ad Quest. 115. p. 468). It is (says he), that by this means we may be put in mind both of our fall by sin, and our resurrection or restitution by the grace of CHRIST: that for six days we pray upon our knees, is in token of our fall by sin; but that on the Lord's day we do not bow the knee, does symbolically represent our resurrection."—*Cave's Primitive Christianity*, part i. c. 7. p. 163.

44. "Their family duties were usually performed in this order: at their first rising in the morning they were wont to meet together, and to betake themselves to prayer (as is plainly implied in Chrysostom's Exhortation¹) to praise God for the protection and refreshment of the night, and to beg His grace and blessing for the following day: this was done by the master of the house, unless some minister of religion were present. 'Tis probable that at this time they recited the Creed or some confession of their faith, by which they professed themselves Christians, and as it were armed themselves against the assaults of dangers and temptations; however I question not but that now they read some parts of Scripture, which they were most ready to do at all times, and therefore certainly would not omit it now. That they had their set hours for prayer, the third, sixth, and ninth hour, is plain both from Cyprian, Clem. Alex. and others: this they borrowed from the Jews. When night approached, before their going to rest, the family was again called to prayer, after which they went to bed: about midnight they were generally wont to rise to pray and to sing hymns to God."—*Cave's Primitive Christianity*, part i. c. 9. pp. 262. 266.

45. "Eusebius (Eccl. Hist. lib. ii. c. 23. p. 63, ex Hege-sippo) reports of St. James the Just, that he was wont every day to go alone into the church, and there kneeling upon the pave-

¹ Hom. I. de Prec. tom. 1. p. 780. Ed. Duc. Basil. Ep. ad Greg. de Vit. Solit. tom. 3. p. 43. (Ep. ii. 2. Ed. B.)

ment so long to pour out his prayers to God, till his knees became as hard as a camel's."—*Cave's Primitive Christianity, ubi sup.*

46. "At first (while the spirit of Christianity was yet warm and vigorous, and the hearts of men passionately inflamed with the love of CHRIST) it is more than probable they communicated every day, or as oft as they came together for publick worship, insomuch that the canons apostolical (Can. 9.) and the synod of Antioch (Can. 2.) threaten every one of the faithful with excommunication, who come to church to hear the Holy Scriptures, but stay not to participate of the LORD's Supper. . . . This custom of receiving the Sacrament every day continued some considerable time in the Church, though in some places longer than in others, especially in the Western Churches. From Cyprian¹ we are fully assured it was so in his time: 'We receive the Eucharist every day (says he), as the food that nourishes us to salvation.'—The like St. Ambrose² seems to intimate of Milan, whereof he was bishop; nay, and after him St. Hierome tells us it was the custom of the Church of Rome³; and St. Augustine seems pretty clearly to intimate that it was not unusual in his time⁴. In the Churches of the East this custom wore off sooner, though more or less according as the primitive zeal did abate and decay; St. Basil⁵ telling us, that in his time they communicated four times a week, on the LORD's day, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, yea and upon other days too, if the memory or festival of any martyr fell upon them."—*Cave's Primitive Christianity, part i. c. 2. p. 389.*

47. GEORGE HERBERT.—"His obedience and conformity to the Church and the discipline thereof, was singularly remarkable. Though he abounded in private devotions, yet went he every morning and evening with his family to the church, and by his example, exhortations, and encouragements, drew the greater part of his parishioners to accompany him daily

¹ De Or. Dom. p. 494. Ed. Ven.

² De Sacr. l. v. c. 4. § 25.

³ Adv. Jovian. lib. i. p. 30, &c.

⁴ De Serm. Dom. in Mont. l. ii. 26. Ep. 118, ad Jan. (Ep. 54. 4. Ed. B.)

⁵ Bas. Ep. 280, ad Cæsarium Patric. (Ep. 93. Ed. B.)

in the publick celebration of divine service."—*Preface to "The Temple."*

"Mr. Herbert's own practice was to appear constantly with his wife and three nieces (the daughters of a deceased sister) and his whole family twice every day at the church prayers, in the chappel which does almost joyn to his parsonage-house. And for the time of his appearing, it was strictly at the canonical hours of 10 and 4, and then and there he lifted up pure and charitable hands to God in the midst of the congregation. And he would joy to have spent that time in that place, where the honour of his Master JESUS dwelleth; and there, by that inward devotion which he testified constantly by an humble behaviour and visible adoration, he, like Josua, brought not only 'his own household thus to serve the LORD,' but brought most of his parishioners, and many gentlemen in the neighbourhood, constantly to make a part of his congregation twice a day; and some of the meaner sort of his parish did so love and reverence Mr. Herbert, that they would let their plow rest when Mr. Herbert's saint's-bell rung to prayers, that they might also offer their devotions to God with him, and would then return back to their plow. And his most holy life was such, that it begat such reverence to God, and to him, that they thought themselves the happier, when they carried Mr. Herbert's blessing back with them to their labour. Thus powerful was his reason, and his example, to perswade others to a practical piety and devotion. And his constant publick prayers did never make him to neglect his own private devotions, nor those prayers that he thought himself bound to perform with his family. . . . Thus he continued, till a consumption so weakened him, as to confine him to his house, or to the chappel, which does almost joyn to it; in which he continued to read prayers constantly twice every day, though he were very weak: in one of which times of his reading, his wife observed him to read in pain, and told him so, and that it wasted his spirits and weakened him; and he confessed it did, but said, 'his life could not be better spent than in the service of his Master JESUS, who had done and suffered so much for him. But (said he) I will not be wilful; for though my spirit be willing,

yet I find my flesh is weak ; and therefore Mr. Bostock shall be appointed to read prayers for me to-morrow, and I will now be only a hearer of them, till this mortal shall put on immortality.' And Mr. Bostock did the next day undertake and continue this happy employment, till Mr. Herbert's death."—*Isaac Walton's Life of Herbert*, pp. 307. 313.

48. NICOLAS FARRER.—" Mr. Farrer having seen the manners and vanities of the world, and found them to be, as Mr. Herbert says, ' a nothing between two dishes,' did so condemn it, that he resolved to spend the remainder of his life in mortifications, and in devotion, and in charity, and to be alwaies prepared for death. . . . He being accompanied with most of his family, did himself use to read the common prayers (for he was a deacon) every day, at the appointed hours of ten and four, in the parish church which was very near his house, and which he had both repaired and adorned : and he did also constantly read the Matins every morning at the hour of six, either in the church, or in an oratory, which was within his own house : and many of the family did there continue with him after the prayers were ended, and there they spent some hours in singing hymns or anthems, sometimes in the church, and often to an organ in the oratory : and there they sometimes betook themselves to meditate, or to pray privately, or to read a part of the New Testament to themselves, or to continue their praying or reading the Psalms : and in case the Psalms were not alwaies read in the day, then Mr. Farrer, and others of the congregation, did at night, at the ring of a watch-bell, repair to the church or oratory, and there betake themselves to prayers, and lauding God, and reading the Psalms that had not been read in the day ; and when these, or any part of the congregation grew weary or faint, the watch-bell was rung, sometimes before, and sometimes after midnight, and then another part of the family rose, and maintained the watch, sometimes by praying, or singing lauds to God, or reading the Psalms ; and when after some hours they also grew weary or faint, then they rung the watch-bell, and were also relieved by some of the former, or by a new part of the société, which continued their devotions until morning. And it is to be noted

that in this continued serving of God, the Psalter, or whole book of Psalms, was in every four-and-twenty hours sung or read over, from the first to the last verse ; and this was done as constantly as the sun runs his circle every day about the world, and then begins again the same instant that it ended. Thus did Mr. Farrer and his happy family serve God day and night : thus did they alwaies behave themselves, as in His presence. And they did alwaies eat and drink by the strictest rules of temperance,—eat and drink so, as to be ready to rise at midnight, or at the call of a watch-bell, and perform their devotions to God. And this course of piety and liberality to his poor neighbours, Mr. Farrer maintained till his death, which was in the year 1639.”—*Walton's Life of G. Herbert*, p. 316. ed. 1675.

49. DR. BEST.—“ The highest orders of men and women in our Church, instead of being exempted from the exercise of daily public prayer by their exalted station, are more loudly called upon than others to be constant in their observance of this duty. It would not be difficult to point out to you the example of a personage [King George III.] who has a greater weight of duties, a greater burthen of cares, a greater variety of earthly concerns upon his mind, than any other individual amongst us, who nevertheless suffers neither business nor any other avocation to prevent his *first* addresses to the MAJESTY of Heaven, for pardon and peace, for grace and direction, for the welfare of his people, and for his own and others' present and future happiness. After this, let no excuses be made for the neglect of our daily service.”—*Dedication of “ Best's Essay,” to the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge.*

50. “ As the want of a congregation is the only justifiable, so is it the only true reason why we do not meet with a daily celebration of it in our parochial churches ; in some of which it would be extremely difficult, if not impracticable, especially in country villages, to comply with her order for it ; and therefore to them we conclude it was not intended to be given.”—*Dr. Best's Essay on the Daily Service of the Church*, 12.

51. “ In St. Matt. xviii. 20, CHRIST hath especially declared, that ‘ where two or three are gathered together in His Name,

there is He in the midst of them.' Comfortable words, indeed, to the daily frequenters of the daily service,—words that carry with them a strong motive to their perseverance in this pious practice,— words that supply the ministers of the Gospel (whose duty it is to attend continually on this very thing) with a powerful reason against being quite disheartened from all further celebration of the daily service, by the non-attendance of so many of their people upon it,—words that are, both to pastor and flock, a great argument for the continuance of the daily service, though so small is the number of frequenters in it."—*Dr. Best's Essay*, 32.

[But the whole of this Essay deserves to be carefully read. It was re-published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, in the year 1794.]

52. **BP. JEREMY TAYLOR.**—"Every minister is obliged publicly or privately to read the Common Prayers every day in the week, at morning and evening; and in great towns and populous places conveniently inhabited, it must be read in churches, that the daily sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving may never cease."—*Advice to the Clergy of Down and Connor*, §. lxxvii.

53. **WILLIAM III.**—"That the bishops do use their utmost endeavour to oblige the clergy to have public prayers in the Church, not only on holy-days and litany-days, but as often as may be, and to celebrate the holy sacrament frequently."—*Injunctions to the Archbishops*, §. 11.

54. **DR. HAMMOND.**—"In the discharge of his ministerial function, he satisfied not himself in diligent and constant preaching only, (a performance wherein some of late have fancied all religion to consist), but much more conceived himself obliged to the offering up the solemn daily sacrifice of prayer for his people, administering the Sacraments, &c. The offices of prayer he had in his church [Penshurst] not only upon the Sundays and festivals, and their eves, as also Wednesdays and Fridays, according to the appointment of the Rubric; (which strict duty and ministration, when it is examined to the bottom, will prove the greatest objection against the Liturgy; as that which, besides its own trouble and austerity, leaves no leisure for factious and

licitious meetings at fairs and markets), but every day in the week, and twice on Saturdays and holiday-eves; for his assistance wherein he kept a curate, and allowed him a comfortable salary. And at those devotions he took order that his family should give diligent exemplary attendance."—*Bp. Fell's Life of Dr. Hammond*, p. 162, et seq.

55. "When we reckon up and audit the expences of the Doctor's (Hammond) time, we cannot pass his constant tribute of it paid by him to Heaven in the offices of prayer, which took up so liberal proportions of each day unto itself, for the ten last years of his life, and probably the preceding. Besides occasional and supernumerary addresses, his certain perpetual returns exceeded David's seven times a day. As soon as he was ready, (which was usually early) he prayed in his chamber with his servant, in a peculiar form composed for that purpose; after this he retired to his own more secret devotions in his closet. Betwixt ten and eleven in the morning he had a solemn intercession in reference to the national calamities; to this, after a little distance, succeeded the morning office of the Church, which he particularly desired to perform in his own person, and would by no means accept the ease of having it read by any other. In the afternoon he had another hour of private prayer, which on Sundays he enlarged. . . . About five o'clock, the solemn private prayer for the nation, and the evening service of the Church returned. At bed-time his private prayers closed the day; and after all even the night was not without its office, the 51st Psalm being his designed midnight entertainment."—*Fell's Life of Hammond*, p. 230. See also, p. 268.

56. MR. WHEATLY.—"People of all ages and nations have been guided by the very dictates of nature not only to appoint some certain seasons to celebrate their more solemn parts of religion, but also to set apart *daily* some portion of time for the performance of divine worship. To his peculiar people, the Jews, God Himself appointed their set times of public devotion; commanding them "to offer up two lambs daily, one in the morning and the other at even," which we find from other places of Scripture (Acts ii. 15. iii. 1.) were at their third and ninth

hours, which answer to our nine and three; that so those burnt-offerings, being types of the great Sacrifice which CHRIST the Lamb of God was to offer up for the sins of the world, might be sacrificed at the same hours wherein His death was begun and finished. . . . And though the Levitical Law expired together with our Saviour, yet the public worship of God must still have some certain times set apart for the performance of it; and accordingly all Christian Churches have been used to have their public devotions performed daily every *morning* or *evening*. The Apostles and primitive Christians continued to observe the same hours of prayer with the Jews, as might easily be shown from the records of the ancient Church. But the Church of England cannot be so happy as to appoint any set hours when either morning or evening prayer shall be said; because, now people are grown so cold and indifferent in their devotions, they would be too apt to excuse their absenting from the public worship, from the inconveniency of the time; and therefore she hath only taken care to enjoin that public prayers be read every 'morning and evening daily throughout the year;' that so all her members may have opportunity of joining in public worship twice at least every day. But to make the duty as practicable and easy both to the minister and people as possible, she hath left the determination of the particular hours to the ministers that officiate, who, considering every one his own and his people's circumstances, may appoint such hours for morning and evening prayer, as they shall judge to be most proper and convenient.

§ 2. But if it be in places where congregations can be had, and "the curate of the parish be at home, and not otherwise reasonably hindered," she expects or enjoins that "he say the same in the parish church," &c. But if for want of a congregation, or some other account, he cannot conveniently read them in the Church, he is then bound to say them in the family where he lives; for by the same Rubric, "all priests and deacons are to say daily the morning and evening prayer, either privately or openly," &c. . . . The occasion of *our* Rubric was probably a rule in the Roman Church, by which, even before the Reformation and the Council of Trent, the clergy were obliged to recite the

canonical hours, (i. e. the offices in the breviary for the several hours of day and night), either publicly in a church or chapel, or privately by themselves. But our Reformers, not approving the priests performing by themselves what ought to be the united devotions of many; and yet not being wholly to discharge the clergy from a constant repetition of their prayers, thought fit to discontinue these solitary devotions; but at the same time ordered, that if a congregation at church could not be had, the public service, both for morning and evening, should be recited in the family where the minister resided. Though according to the first book of King Edward, "this is not meant that any man shall be bound to the saying of it, but such as from time to time, in cathedral and collegiate churches, parish churches and chapels to the same annexed, shall serve the congregation."—*Wheatly on the Common Prayer*, pp. 83, 84. Sixth Ed.

57. "That the primitive Christians, besides their solemn service on Sundays, had public prayers *every morning and evening, daily*, has already been hinted, but a learned gentleman (Bingham, *Ant. B. 13. c. 9. s. 1. vol. 5. p. 281.*) is of the opinion that this must be restrained to times of peace; and that during the time of public persecution, they were forced to confine their religious meetings to the LORD's day only. And it is certain that Pliny and Justin Martyr, who both describe the manner of the Christian worship, do neither of them make mention of any assembly for public worship on any other day; so that their silence is a negative argument that in their time was no such assembly, unless perhaps some distinction may be made between the general assembly of both city and country on the LORD's day, and the particular assemblies of the city Christians (who had better opportunities to meet) on other days; which distinction we often meet with in the following ages, when Christianity was come to its maturity and perfection. However, it was not long after Justin Martyr's time, before we are sure that the Church observed the custom of meeting solemnly on Wednesdays and Fridays, to celebrate the Communion, and to perform the same service as on the LORD's day itself, unless perhaps the sermon was wanting. The same also might be showed from as early

authorities in relation to the festivals of their martyrs, and the whole fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide. [Tert. de Id. et de Cor.] Nor need we look down many years lower, before we meet with express testimony of their meeting *every day* for the public worship of God. For S. Cyprian tells us, that in his time it was customary to receive the holy Eucharist *every day*; a plain demonstration that they had *every day* public assemblies, since we know the Eucharist was never consecrated but in such open and public assemblies of the Church. §. 2. That these daily devotions consisted of an *evening* as well as a *morning* service, even from S. Cyprian's time, the learned author I just now referred to (Bingham, ubi sup.) endeavours to prove. However, in a century or two afterwards, the case is plain, for the author of the 'Constitutions' not only speaks of it, but gives us the order of both the services.—l. 8. c. 37." *Id.* pp. 113, 114.

58. DEAN COMBER.—We may call this (public prayer) the life and soul of religion, the anima mundi, that universal soul which quickens, unites, and moves the whole Christian world. Nor is the case of a private man more desperate, when he breathes no more in secret prayer, than the condition of a church is, where public devotions cease. St. Hierome, out of Hippolytus, puts the cessation of Liturgy as a principal sign of the coming of Antichrist. (Hieron. Com. in Dan.) And nothing more clearly shows a profane generation, the very title of wicked men in Scripture being that "they call not upon God." It is well if any of us can excuse ourselves; but the general neglect of daily prayers by ministers, (who are both desirous and bound to perform them,) doth too sadly testify they are tired out with the people's constant absence, and altogether witnesseth an universal decay of true piety. Perhaps the dishonour that is cast upon God and religion, will not move these disregarders and neglecters, since they live so that a stranger could not imagine they had any God at all. But I hope they have yet so much charity for their own persons, that it may startle them to consider what mischiefs are hereby brought upon their own selves as well as others. Wherefore, let them ask the cause of all that atheism and profaneness, luxury and oppression, lying and deceiving, malice and bitterness, that is broke in upon us, to the torment

and disquiet of the whole world. Let them ask why they plague others with their sins, and others requite them again? and it will appear that all this is come upon us because we forget God and heaven, death and judgment, which daily prayers would mind us of. . . . But if these evils be too thin and spiritual, let it be inquired whence our national and personal calamities proceed, epidemical diseases, wars, and pestilences? Whence comes the multiplication of heresies, the prevalency and pride of the enemies of the true religion? The Jews will tell you, "Jacob's voice in the synagogue keeps off Esau's hands from the people." We have disrespected and slighted God and his worship, and He may justly put us out of his protection: "If he meet us not in his house, he may go away displeased¹," and then we lie open to all evil when our defence is departed from us; and they that provoke him so to doe, are enemies to themselves, and to the Church and state where they live, indeed the worst of neighbours². But notwithstanding all this, while sober and devout men lament this epidemical iniquity, and groan under the sad effects thereof, passionately wishing a speedy remedy, the offenders grow bold by their numbers, and hardened by this evil custome, till they now despise a reproof, and deny this negligence to be a sin, because they have no mind to amend it. But these are of two kinds: 1. Those that make their business their apology, and suppose it is unreasonable to expect them every day at common prayer, and judge it sufficient to say they cannot come. 2. Those who despise the Prayers of the Church, &c. . . .

1. We shall demonstrate the *reasonableness* of the daily attendance on public prayers, and that principally from the universal reason of all the world, and the concurrent practice and consent of all mankind, which agrees in this, that wheresoever they own a God true or false, they daily perform some worship to him³. The very heathens, beside their private requests and vows, made

¹ Si Deus synagogam intrat, et nemo inventus est, abiit iratus, ut Isa. 1. 2.—*Buxt. Synag.*

² Quisquis incolit civitatem in qua extat synagoga, et eam tecum non adiit, is est vicinus malus.—*R. Nath. de Latr.*

³ Bel and the Dragon, 4.

particular addresses to their temples in all their great concerns, and yet abstained not from the daily sacrifices, nor from the frequent festivals of their numerous deities; in Egypt (as Porphyry relates) they praised their gods with hymns three or four times every day. The Turks are called to their houses of prayer five times every day, and six times upon the Fridays; and he that notoriously absents himself is punished with disgrace, and hath a fine set upon him. And if our Saviour think it reasonable we should doe something *more* [περισσόν], how dare we call it unreasonable, when we are not enjoined to doe so much as they? But to go on, who knows not that the Jews had set hours of prayers, when all devout people (even Christ's Apostles) went to the temple or synagogues to offer up public supplications? And these hours are observed among them exactly to this very day. One instance of their strictness in this particular we learn from the Talmud; where it appears that because of the distance of the temple, and the impossibility of attendance on the daily sacrifice, those who could not come hired certain devout men who were called "*virī stationis*," *the men of appearance*, to present themselves daily there and put up petitions for them. And the Pharisees not only observed the usual hours of prayer, but doubled them, and zealously kept them all. Now Jesus tells us, our righteousness must exceed theirs, if ever we hope to enter into His kingdom. Which precept of His, some of us could almost afford to call an intolerable burthen, for we call a smaller matter by a worse name. To pass, then, to the Christian Church. We have an express command, to pray "without ceasing," that is, without omitting the set times which every day return, and ought to be observed. In obedience hereunto, the Church in the Apostles' time, met at daily prayers; and so did the primitive Christians for many ages after, who had their Liturgy, Eucharist, and Hymns, even in the night, when persecution prevented them in the day. And surely their zeal and fervour is a huge reproach to our sloth, who yet call ourselves of the same religion, and are so far from venturing lives and estates to enjoy opportunities of devotions, that we will not leave our shop nor our company, nay, our very idleness half an hour, for a freer and

more easie worship than they could enjoy. Surely we are as unlike them in practice as we are like in name and profession. Twice a day was not enough for them, wherefore they appointed (in the days of martyrdom) three set times in every day for prayer, nine, twelve, and three in the afternoon, and punctually observed them. Afterwards, in more quiet times, it was wonderful to behold the orderly performance of morning and evening prayer in huge assemblies of men and women, who failed not to their constant attendance. These are the men and times whose principles we are reformed by ; but I wish that corrupted Church, who forced us to a separation, do not prove more conformable to the outward part of their practice in a due observance of public prayer, than we who have more knowledge, better prayers, fewer excuses, and yet less devotion. Wherefore let us no more complain of our own Church for expecting us at daily prayers. Let us rather challenge all nations and people for fools, and declare it unreasonable that we should have any God at all, or let Him have any of our time, though He give us all we have. Let us tell the world, we are self-sufficient for the conduct and defence of ourselves and our affairs, and then we shall discover ourselves what we are. We must not feign ourselves too busy ; for we do lay aside our business daily, for causes less weighty, and advantages more inconsiderable. If vanity or lust, Sathan or his emissaries call, we can find leisure ; and why not when God calls ? unless we think all that time lost which is spent upon His service, or as if we needed not His blessing. In short, if unavoidable business did hinder us and nothing else, many men might come always, and all sometimes, and every day an hundred for one that now comes. Wherefore it is sloth and covetousness, or atheism and irreligion, keeps us away. And if so, what signifie those pretences of praying at home (which ought to be done too) ? Verily, no more than those of the idle school-boy who seeks a corner, not to learn, but play in without disturbance. And truly it is to be doubted that constant neglecters of publick prayers use seldom and slight devotions in private, for they make the same objections against them. Finally, therefore, do but remember the reasonableness of this is

to be tried at a higher tribunal, and come as often as God can in reason expect to meet you there, and I shall ask no more. But it is urged that these prayers, though good in themselves, will grow flat and nauseous by daily use, and consequently become an impediment to devotion. *Ans.* We come not to the house of God for recreation, but for a supply of our wants ; and therefore this might be a better reason of an empty theatre than a thin congregation. We come to God in publick, to petition for the relief of our own general necessities, and those of the whole Church, viz., for pardon of sin, peace of conscience, and succours of divine grace, and a deliverance from sin and Sathan, death and hell ; as also for food and raiment, health and strength, protection and success in all our concerns ; and more generally for the peace of the kingdom, the prosperity of the Church, the propagation of the Gospel, and the success of its ministers. Now these things are always needful, and always the same, to be prayed for every day alike. Wherefore, (unless we be so vain as to fancy God is delighted with variety and change as well as we), what need is there to alter the phrase every day, or what efficacy can a new model give to our old requests. Particular wants and single cases must be supplied by the closet devotions, for the publick, whether by form or extempore, can never reach all those, which are so numerous and variable. Wherefore one form may fit all that ought to be asked in the Church ; and why then should we desire a needless and infinite variety and alteration ? If we do, it is out of curiosity, not necessity. The poor man is most healthfull whose labour procures him both appetite and digestion, who seldom changeth his dish, yet finds a relish in it, and a new strength from it every day ; and so it is with the sober and industrious Christian, who busying himself in serving God, gets daily a new sense of his wants, and consequently a fresh stomach to these holy forms, which are never flat or dull to him that brings new affections to them every day. It is the epicure and luxurious, the crammed lazy wanton, or the diseased man, that need *quelques choses*, or sauces, to make his daily bread desirable. And if his be our temper, it is a sign of a diseased scul, and an effect

of our surfeiting on holy things. In this we resemble those murmurers who despised the bread of heaven, because they had it *daily*, and loathed manna itself, calling it in scorn *dry meat*. This was sufficient to sustain their bodies, and satisfy their hunger, but they required "meat for their soul," that is, to feed their fancies and their lusts; even as we do, for whom the Church hath provided prayers sufficient to express our needs, but not to satiate our wanton fancies, nor gratify the lust of our curiosity; and we complain they are insipid; so perhaps they are to such, for the manna had no taste to the wicked; but it suited itself to the appetite and taste of every *good* man, as the Jews tell us in their traditions. Sure I am it is true here; for if we be curious and proud, or carnal and profane, there is no gust in the Common Prayers; but a truly pious man can every day here exercise repentance and faith, love and desire, and so use them as to obtain fresh hopes of mercy, peace of conscience, increase of grace, and expectations of glory; and whoever finds not this, the fault is not in the prayers, but in the indisposition of his own heart."—*Dr. Comber's "Discourse on the daily frequenting of the Common Prayer."*

59. "I conclude this preface with a twofold request: First, to my brethren of the clergy, that they will read these prayers so *frequently*, that such as have leisure may never want opportunity thus to serve God; and so *fervently*, that those who do attend them, may be brought into an high esteem of them. It was a great end to God's instituting the priest's office, and a principal motive to our pious ancestors in their liberal provisions for it: That there might be an order of men on purpose, to *pray daily* for all mankind, especially for such as could not daily attend Divine Service: So that if we neglect this daily sacrifice, we neither answer the designs of God nor of our benefactors. And as we are not excused by, so we ought not to be discouraged at the people's slowness in coming to daily prayers, for their presence is indeed a comfort to us, and an advantage to themselves; but their absence doth not hinder the success, nor should it obstruct the performance of our prayers. The promise of Jesus is made to two or three; and since our petitions are

directed to God, we need not regard who is absent, so long as he is present, to whom we speak; for he accepts our requests, not by the number, but the sincerity of those that make them. Let our congregation, therefore, be great or small, it is our duty to read these prayers daily; and every day to do it with such fervency and reverence, as may declare that our affections keep pace with our words, while we are presenting so excellent requests to so infinite a Majesty upon so weighty occasions. And if the people daily come, and constantly use the Common Prayer in this manner, they will neither be tired with the length, nor wearied with the frequent repetition thereof; for it will appear to be the most noble and comfortable exercise that religion doth afford; it will increase their graces, multiply their blessings, and fit them for the never-ceasing service of the heavenly choir."—*Ibid.* sub fin.

60. **BP. BULL.**—"When the Bishop came to live at Brecknock, they had publick prayers in that place only upon Wednesdays and Fridays, but by his care, during his stay there, they have prayers now every morning and evening in the week. The method he took to establish this daily exercise of devotion was briefly this: Upon his visiting the college in that town, he made the following proposal to the prebendaries, that whereas they had each of them a certain yearly stipend under the name of a pension out of their respective prebends, towards reading of daily prayers in the college chapel, which by reason of its distance from the body of the town, were very little frequented, and indeed hardly by any but the scholars of the free-school, which is adjoining to it; whether it would not be a very useful and acceptable piece of service to the town, if those pensions should be applied to encourage the vicar of Brecknock to perform daily the morning and evening service in the town Church or Chapel, as it is usually called. This proposal appeared to them so reasonable, that they all readily agreed to it. By this means the vicarage is considerably augmented, and the college prayers are still kept up for the benefit of the scholars, to whom chiefly they could be of use since the ruin of the college, the master of the school having ever since discharged that duty;

and the Bishop, for his encouragement, gave him a prebend just by the town, with a design that it might for ever be annexed to the school. And whereas at Caermarthen they had only morning prayers upon week days, when his Lordship first came to that town, he set up also constant evening prayers ; and towards this additional labour, he allowed the curate the yearly synodals of the archdeaconry ; to which Mr. Archdeacon Tenison, who is very ready to contribute to all works of charity and piety, being then upon the place, added twenty shillings a year out of his revenue there ; and the prayers are still kept up and well frequented.”—*From the Life of Bishop Bull, by Mr. Nelson, p. 439.*

61. BISHOP STILLINGFLEET.—“ I could heartily wish that in greater places, especially in such towns where there are people more at liberty, the constant morning and evening prayers were duly and devoutly read, as it is already done with good success in London, and some other cities. By this means religion will gain ground, when the publick offices are daily performed ; and the people will be more acquainted with Scripture, in hearing the lessons ; and have a better esteem of the prayers, when they become their daily service, which they offer up to God as their morning and evening sacrifice ; and the design of our Church will be best answered, which appoints the order for morning and evening prayer to be said daily throughout the year.”—*Charge to the Diocese of Worcester, 1690. Works, vol. iii. p. 630.*

62. BISHOP BEVERIDGE.—“ Daily prayers are slighted and neglected among us, far more, to our shame be it spoken, than among any other sort of people in the world. The Papists will rise up in judgment with this generation, for they every day observe their canonical hours for praying, at least, for that which they believe to be so. The Jews will rise up in judgment with this generation, for they never omitted to offer their daily sacrifices, so long as they had an house of God wherein to offer them. The Turks shall rise up in judgment with this generation, for when their priests call the people to prayer, as they do several times every day, they immediately run to their mosques or temples, and if any offer to stay at home, he is

shunned by all, as a wicked atheistical wretch. The heathens will rise up in judgment with this generation, for if they had such opportunities as we have of praying and praising their ALMIGHTY CREATOR every day, I doubt not but they would do it far more constantly than it is done by most of us. What then can we expect but that some severe judgment or other will ere long be inflicted on us, when people generally live as without God in the world, notwithstanding the clear discoveries that He hath made of Himself unto them, and notwithstanding the means of grace which are so constantly administered to them, but they will not use them?"—*Works*, Vol. v. p. 234.

63. BISHOP GIBSON.—"As for those, to whom God has given greater degrees of leisure from the business of life, to attend to reading, prayer, and other exercises and offices of religion; they must remember that He will expect from them greater *improvements* in purity and goodness, suitable to the special *advantages* and *opportunities* which He has bestowed upon them. And among those may well be reckoned, the provisions made in these two great cities for *daily prayers* in the Church, which are attended by many serious Christians, to their great spiritual benefit, and might be attended by many more, without prejudice to health, or hinderance to business."—*IVth Pastoral Letter*. Ench. Theol. ii. 302.

64. ARCHBISHOP SECKER.—"But besides your and their duty on the Lord's day, it is appointed, that all ministers of parishes read prayers on holy-days, on Wednesdays, and Fridays; and undoubtedly your endeavours to procure a congregation at such times ought not to be wanting. Were I to repeat to you the strong expressions which my great predecessor Bishop Fell used, in requiring this part of ecclesiastical duty, they would surprise you. But I content myself with saying that public worship was from the very first ages constantly performed on the two stationary days of each week; that all holy-days appointed by the Church were carefully observed by the clergy, and the number of them now is not burthensome; that where you can get a competent number to attend at these times, you will act a very

pious and useful, as well as regular part ; that your own houses will sometimes furnish a small congregation, and what success you may have with others, nothing but trials, repeated from time to time, can inform you.”—*2d Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford*, pp. 71, 2.

65. BISHOP BUTLER.—“ That which men have accounted religion in the several countries of the world, generally speaking, has had a great and conspicuous part in all public appearances, and the face of it been kept up with great reverence throughout all ranks, from the highest to the lowest ; not only upon occasional solemnities, but also in the daily course of behaviour. In the heathen world their superstition was the chief subject of statuary, sculpture, painting, and poetry. It mixed itself with business, civil forms, diversions, domestic entertainments, and every part of common life. The Mahometans are obliged to short devotions five times between morning and evening. In Roman Catholic countries, people cannot pass a day without having religion recalled to their thoughts, by some or other memorial of it ; by some ceremony or public religious form occurring in their way ; besides their frequent holidays, the short prayers they are daily called to, and the occasional devotions enjoined by confessors. By these means their superstition sinks deep into the minds of the people, and their religion also into the minds of such among them as are serious and well disposed. Our Reformers, considering that some of these observances were in themselves wrong and superstitious, and others of them made subservient to the purposes of superstition, abolished them, reduced the form of religion to great simplicity, and enjoined no more particular rules, nor left any thing more of what was external in religion, than was in a manner necessary to preserve a sense of religion itself upon the minds of the people. But a great part of this is neglected by the generality amongst us ; for instance, the service of the church, not only upon common days, but also upon saints’ days, and several other things might be mentioned. Thus they have no customary admonition, no public call to recollect the thoughts of God and religion from

one Sunday to another. It was far otherwise under the Law. 'These words,' says Moses to the children of Israel, 'which I command thee,' &c. And as they were commanded this, so it is obvious how much the constitution of that law was adapted to effect it, and keep religion ever in view. And without somewhat of this nature, piety will grow languid, even among the better sort of men; and the worst will go on quietly in an abandoned course, with fewer interruptions from within than they would have were religious reflections forced oftener upon their minds, and consequently with less probability of their amendment. Indeed, in most ages of the Church, the care of reasonable men has been, as there has been for the most part occasion, to draw the people off from laying too great weight upon external things, upon formal acts of piety. But that state of matters is quite changed now with us. These things are neglected to a degree which is, and cannot but be attended with a decay of all that is good. It is highly seasonable now to instruct the people in the importance of external religion. . . . The frequent returns, whether of public devotion, or of any thing else, to introduce religion into men's serious thoughts, will have an influence upon them, in proportion as they are susceptible of religion, and not given over to a reprobate mind. For this reason, besides others, the service of the Church ought to be celebrated as often as you can have a congregation to attend it. But since the body of the people, especially in country places, cannot be brought to attend it oftener than one day in a week, and since this is in no sort enough to keep up in them a due sense of religion, it were greatly to be wished they could be persuaded to any thing which might in some measure supply the want of more frequent public devotions, or serve the like purposes."—*Charge to the Clergy of Durham, 1751.*

The above extracts were collected by a friend of the writer, when a student for holy orders, about 24 or 25 years since, and

have not long since come to hand accidentally. It appeared desirable that they should be published, with as little alteration as possible, even in form or order, so as to establish the fact, that we have always had in our prayer-books, and in the writings of our ritualists, and other eminent divines, a witness against our neglect of this duty; and a witness so clear and decided, as to arrest the attention of a young person studying these books at the very time when the daily service was most completely disused, and in a manner forgotten.

It will be seen, therefore, that this collection does not pretend to be a *catena*, nor to contain all the testimonies in favour of this practice, which are to be found in the divines of our branch of the Church.

It is believed, however, that any one who will seriously consider the extracts that are here set forth, will find in them enough to convince him,

First, That the objections against the practice, and the difficulties in the way of restoring it, are not so great as they are supposed to be.

Secondly, That the duty itself is of such importance, one might perhaps say of so great necessity, for the maintenance of true religion, that it would be no more than right to make some venture, and, if need be, patiently to suffer discouragement and mortification for the sake of performing it.

And, at any rate, it is quite certain that this view of the daily service is very far from being in any way modern or "new-fangled."

It has been made a point of conscience to quote the passages exactly as they stand in the books whence they are taken, and in such a manner as to give a fair impression of the views entertained by the respective writers.

In consequence, there are one or two statements contained in them, which seems to the person who sends this collection to call for some kind of protest on his part.

It is submitted, that the excuse for the neglect of the service in country villages, which Dr. Best suggests in extract 50, would

be a plea for omitting it in town churches, and even in cathedrals, where there may be no congregation. And it should be considered whether what he says in that passage be in any way reconcilable to his opinions as more solemnly and distinctly expressed in the extract that follows. And the first part of this observation appears applicable also to a statement of Dr. Bisse, in No. 30, that "the daily offering cannot be observed in lesser parish churches."

Further, from the extracts here made from Wheatly and Nicholls, it would seem that they thought the Church meant to "discontinue" or discourage all "solitary" repeating of her services. And indeed the language used by Dr. Nicholls does not appear suitable to the seriousness and sanctity of such a subject.

But the writer of this notice begs leave humbly to submit, that, although the services ought, if possible, to be read in the church, or in some family congregation, yet should any clergyman be prevented from saying them thus "openly," he is bound by the rubric to say them to himself "privately," unless prevented by some urgent cause. Such, it is apprehended, was the view of the rubric generally entertained in the seventeenth century.

And the writer would venture to express his conviction, that if a churchman were, under such discouraging circumstances, to persevere in the private practice of this duty, he would gain thereby the greatest comfort and advantage; and when restored to a more full enjoyment of the means of grace, would find his delight and edification in the services increased beyond anything he could have possibly anticipated.

He thought, moreover, it might be useful to add four fresh authorities,—one from the most simple and practical, as well as the most learned (perhaps) of our ritualists, and the others as illustrating the practice and opinions of three very distinguished bishops.

BISHOP SPARROW.—"Whatsoever the world think, thus to be the Lord's remembrancers, putting Him in mind of the people's

wants (Isaiah lxii.), being, as it were, the angels of the Lord, interceding for the people, and carrying up the daily prayers of the Church in their behalf, is one of the most useful and principal parts of the priest's office. So St. Paul tells us, who, in the First Epistle to Timothy, chap. ii., exhorts Bishop Timothy, that he should take care, *first of all*, that this holy service be offered up to God. 'I exhort, *first of all*, that prayers and supplications, intercessions and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings, &c. What is the meaning of this 'first of all?' I will that this holy service be offered up daily. And the faithful know how we observe this rule of St. Paul, offering up daily this holy sacrifice morning and evening. *See Chrysostom on the place.*"

St. Paul, in the first chapter of this Epistle, at the eighteenth verse, had charged his "son Timothy to war a good warfare," to "hold faith and a good conscience," and presently adds, "I exhort therefore, that first of all prayers, &c. be made." As if he had said, You cannot possibly hold faith and a good conscience in your pastoral office, unless, first of all, you be careful to make and offer up prayers, &c. For this is the first thing to be done, and most highly to be regarded by you. Preaching is a very useful part of the priest's office, and St. Paul exhorts Timothy to "preach the word, be instant in season, out of season," and the more because he was a bishop, and had to plant and water many churches, in the infancy of Christianity, among many seducers and temptations: but yet, *first of all* he exhorts, that this daily office of presenting prayers to the throne of grace, in behalf of the Church, be carefully looked to.

This charge of St. Paul to Timothy, holy Church here lays upon all those that are admitted into that holy office of the ministry, that they should offer up to God this holy sacrifice of prayers, praises, and thanksgivings, this savour of rest, daily—morning and evening. And would all those whom it concerns look well to this part of their office, I should not doubt but that God would be as gracious and bountiful to us in the performance of this service, as He promised to be to the Jews in the offering

of the lamb, morning and evening, Exod. xxix. 42, 43. "He would meet us and speak with us," that is, graciously answer our petitions; "He would dwell with us and be our God," and we should know by comfortable experiments of His great and many blessings, that He is the LORD our God.—*Rationale of the Common Prayer—on the Rubric which orders the daily service*, p. 9.

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.—"I stayed at Lambeth till the evening, to avoid the gazing of the people. I went to evening prayer in my chapel. The Psalms of the day, *Ps.* 93 and 94, and *Chap.* 50 of *Isai*, gave me great comfort. God make me worthy of it, and fit to receive it."—*Diary*, p. 60.

BISHOP KEN.—"But your greatest zeal must be spent for the public prayers, in the constant and devout use of which the public safety, both of Church and State, is highly concerned: *be sure then to offer up to God every day the morning and evening prayers*; offer it up in your family at least, or rather, as far as your circumstances may possibly permit, offer it up in the church, especially if you live in a great town, and say over the Litany every morning during the whole of Lent. This I might enjoin you to do on your canonical obedience, 'but, for love's sake, I rather beseech you,' and I cannot recommend to you a more devout and comprehensive form of penitent and public intercession than that, or more proper for the season. Be not discouraged if but few come to the solemn assemblies, but go to the 'house of prayer,' where God is well known for a sure refuge; go, though you go alone, or but with one besides yourself; and there, as you are God's 'remembrancer,' keep not silence, and give Him no rest, till He establish, till He make Jerusalem a praise in the earth.'—*Bp. Ken's Pastoral Letter to his Clergy, concerning their behaviour during Lent.* 1688.

BISHOP WILSON.—From Archdeacon Hewetson's advice to him the day he was ordained Deacon, the Festival of St. Peter, 1686.

"VI. To say the morning and evening prayers, either publicly or privately, every day, is, T. W. knows, the Church's express command, in one of the rubricks before the calendar.

"VIII. Never to miss the Church's public devotions twice a day, when unavoidable business, or want of health, or of a church,

as in travelling, doth not hinder."—*Cruttwell's Life*, at the beginning of Bp. Wilson's Work, pp. 3 & 4, folio ed.

How well this advice was followed appears from the following statement further on :—

" Every summer morning at six, and every winter morning at seven, the family attended him to their devotions in the chapel, where he himself, or one of his students, performed *the service of the day, and in the evening they did the same.*"—*Ibid.* p. 15.

TABLE OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN LONDON

IN THE BEGINNING OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY,

AS STATED IN A WORK OF THE DAY, CALLED

“PIETAS LONDINENSIS.”

(From the “British Magazine” for March, 1838.)

DAILY AND OCCASIONAL SERVICES.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>Aylesbury Chapel, St. John's-close—Wednesdays and holydays, at 10 a.m.</p> <p>Alban, St., Wood-street, and St. Olave, Cripplegate—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.</p> <p>All Saints, or Allhallows Barking, Tower-street—Daily, at 8 a.m. and 7 p.m. Holy Communion every Sunday at 12.</p> <p>All Saints, or Allhallows, Bread-street, and St. John the Evangelist—Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent, all holydays, at 11 a.m.</p> <p>All Saints, or Allhallows the Great and the Less, Thames-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, holydays, and public days, at 11 a.m.</p> <p>All Saints, or Allhallows, Lombard-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.</p> <p>All Saints, or Allhallows, London-wall—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.</p> <p>All Saints, or Allhallows, Staining-lane—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.</p> <p>Alphage, St., Cripplegate—Wednesdays, Fridays, holydays, and public days, at 11 a.m.</p> <p>Andrew, St., Holborn—Daily; S. 6, W. 7, and 11 a.m., and 3 p.m. Holy Com. every Sunday at 12, and several occasions. Easter day, 7 a.m., and 12.</p> <p>Andrew, St., Undershaft, or St. Mary at Axe—Daily; S. 6, W. 7, and 11 a.m., and 6 p.m.</p> <p>Andrew, St., Wardrobe, and St. Anne Blackfriars—Wednesdays, Fridays,</p> | <p>all holy and public days, at 11 a.m.</p> <p>Anne and Agnes, Sts.—Wednesdays, Fridays, all holy and public days, at 11 a.m. Holy Com. three last Sundays in the month, at 7 a.m.</p> <p>Anne, St., Soho—Daily; S. 6, W. 7, and 11 a.m., and 4 and 6 p.m. Holy Com. first and third Sundays, and Good Friday, at 12; Christmas, Easter and Whit Sunday, at 7 a.m., and 12.</p> <p>Anthony, or Antholine, St., Watling-street, and St. John Baptist—Daily; S. 6, W. 7, a.m.</p> <p>Augustine, or Austin, St., Old-change—Wednesdays, Fridays, holy and public days, at 11 a.m.</p> <p>Bartholomew, St., the Great—Daily in the last week in the month, at 11 a.m., and 5 p.m.</p> <p>Bartholomew, St., the Less—Daily, at 11 a.m.</p> <p>Bartholomew, St., the Little, near the Royal Exchange—Wednesdays, Fridays, holydays, and public days, at 11 a.m., and daily, 6 p.m.</p> <p>Berwick-street Chapel, Soho—Daily, at 11 a.m., and 5 p.m.</p> <p>Benedict, St., or St. Bennet Fink, Threadneedle-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.</p> <p>Benedict, or Bennet, St., Gracechurch-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, all holy and public days, at 11 a.m.</p> <p>Benedict, or Bennet, St., and St. Peter, St. Paul's Wharf—Wednesdays, Fridays, and all holy and</p> |
|--|--|

- public days, at 11 a.m.; evening only on holidays and Saturdays, at 3.
- Bloomsbury Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 3 p.m. Holy Com. on the third Sunday in the month.
- Botolph, St., Aldersgate—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 3 p.m.
- Botolph, St., Aldgate—Daily, at 11 a.m.; S. 7, W. 8 p.m.; Wednesday evening always at 6.
- Botolph, St., Bishopsgate—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.
- Bridget, or Brides, St., Fleet-street—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 8 p.m.
- Bridewell Chapel—Holy Communion on the third Sunday in the month.
- Charterhouse Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m.; S. 5, W. 2 p.m.
- Christ's Church, Newgate-street, and St. Leonard, Foster-lane—Daily, at 11 a.m.; S. 5, W. 3 p.m.
- Christ's Church, Surrey—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.
- Christopher, St., Threadneedle-street—Daily, at 6 a.m. and 6 p.m.
- Clement Danes, St., Strand—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 3 and 8 p.m.; Sundays, 3 and 7 p.m. Holy Com. every Sunday, besides other times.
- Clement, St., in St. Clement's-lane, City—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.
- Dionyse, or Dionis, St., or Dionis Back Ch., or St. Dennis or Dionysius the Areopagite—Daily, at S. 8, W. 9 a.m., and 6 p.m.
- Drapers' Alms-house Chapel, St. George's-fields—Daily, at S. 8, W. 9 a.m. N.B. The Liturgy is not used in this Chapel, but a form of prayer, because the foundation will not support a chaplain. The inhabitants attend the mother church on Sundays, and at some other times. There is another chapel at Newington Butts belonging to an alms-house built by the same founder, Mr. John Walter, citizen and draper.
- Duke-street Chapel, St. James's-park—Daily, at 11 a.m., and 4 p.m. Holy Communion every Sunday and holyday.
- Dunstan, St., in the East—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.
- Dunstan, St., Stepney—Daily, at 11 a.m.; S. 6, W. 3 p.m. Holy Com. first and second Sundays of the month.
- Dunstan, St., in the West—Daily, at 7 a.m. and 3 p.m.; on Wednesdays, Fridays, holy and public days, again at 11 a.m. Holy Communion every Sunday and holyday at 12; every day for a week after Christmas, Easter, and Whit Sunday at 8, after morning prayers.
- Edmund, St., the King and Martyr, Lombard-street—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.
- Ely House Chapel (if the Bishop is resident)—Daily, at 8 a.m. and 4 p.m.; on Sundays, holy and public days, again at 11 a.m.
- Ethelburga, or Ethelburgh, St., Bishopsgate-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.
- Fleet Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 3 p.m.; but on Sundays and holydays, at 10 a.m. Holy Communion, besides the usual times, before Michaelmas Term.
- George, St., Bloomsbury—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 4 p.m. Holy Com. every Sunday, Good Friday, New Year's day, and other solemn days.
- George, St., Botolph-lane—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.
- George, St., the Martyr, Southwark—Wednesdays, Fridays, holy and public days, at 10 a.m.
- Giles, St., Cripplegate—On Litany and holydays, at 11 a.m. and 8 p.m.
- Giles, St., in the Fields—Daily, at 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. Holy Com. first and second Sundays of the month after prayers at 7, and some other occasions.
- Gray Coat Hospital Chapel, Westminster—Daily, at 7 a.m. and 6 p.m.
- Gray's Inn Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m.; S. 5, W. 3 p.m. Holy Com. twice a term, besides Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide.
- Helen, St., the Great, Bishopsgate-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.
- Hog Lane Chapel, Monmouth-street—Daily, at 11 a.m.
- Horse Guards Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m.
- Hoxton Hospital Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m.; S. 5, W. 3 p.m. Holy

Com. last Sunday of the month, and other solemn occasions.

James, St., Clerkenwell—Daily, at 11 a.m.; Saturday only, at 2 p.m.

James, St., Chapel, or Chapel Royal—Daily, at 8 and 11 a.m. and 5 p.m. N.B. During her Majesty's absence only, at 11 a.m., and 5 p.m. Holy Com. twice every Sunday when the Queen is resident, otherwise once.

James, St., in Duke's-place, Aldgate—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m. Holy Communion second Sunday of the month.

James, St., Thames-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.

James, St., Westminster—Daily; 8. 6, W. 7, and 11 a.m. and 3 and 6 p.m. Holy Com. second Sunday in the month, every Sunday from Palm Sunday to Trinity Sunday, New Year's day, on Christmas and other great days, twice.

John, St., of Jerusalem, Hackney—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.

John, St., Wapping—Daily; 8. 8, W. 9 a.m.; 8. 6, W. 3 p.m.

Islington Almshouse Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 4 p.m.

Katharine, St. Coleman—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.

Katharine, St., Cree—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 10 a.m.; on Saturdays; 8. 4, W. 3 p.m.

Katharine, St., by the Tower—Daily, at 11 a.m.

King's-street Chapel, St. James's—Daily; 8. 6, W. 7, and 11 a.m. and 3 and 6 p.m. Holy Com. last Sunday in the month.

Knightbridge Chapel.

Lambeth Chapel—Daily; 8. 7, W. 8, and 12 a.m., and 2 and 9 p.m.

Lamb's Chapel, Hart-street, Cripple-gate—Wednesdays and Fridays, at 8 a.m. Holy Communion never administered.

Lawrence, St., Jewry—Daily, at 6 a.m. and 8 p.m.; on Mondays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, again at 11 a.m.; on Thursday evenings again, at 3 p.m. Holy Com. every Sunday at 8, except the first, then at 12.

Leonard, St., Shoreditch—Wednes-

days, Fridays, holy and state days, at 11 a.m.

Lincoln's Inn Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 5 p.m. Holy Com. Christmas, Easter, second Sunday in September, and first and last Sunday of every Term.

London Workhouse Chapel, Bishopsgate-street—Daily, at 6 a.m. and 6 p.m.

Ludgate Prison Chapel—Daily, at 10 a.m. N.B. Sixpence allowed each time. The most prudent layman reads, if no clergyman is in prison.

Magnus, St., London-bridge—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 8 p.m.

Margaret, St., Lothbury—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.

Margaret, St., Pattens—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.

Margaret, St., Westminster—Fridays, holy and state days, at 10 a.m.; but daily, 8. 6, W. 7 p.m.

Marshalsea, Chapel of—Wednesdays and Saturdays, at 3 p.m.

Martin, St.—Daily; 8. 6, W. 7 a.m. and 5 p.m.; on Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, again at 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. Holy Com. 1st Sunday, Christmas day, Easter and Whitsunday, twice; but the rest of the Sundays, and New Year's day, Good Friday, and Ascension day, once.

Martin, St., Ludgate—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 6 p.m.

Martin, St., Dutewich or Otterwick—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.

Mary, St., Abchurch—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.; holydays and on Saturdays, at 4 p.m.

Mary, St., Aldermanbury—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.

Mary, St., Aldermay—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.

Mary, St., le-Bow—Daily, at 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. Holy Communion every holyday, at 8 a.m.

Mary, St., at Hill—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.; and on Saturdays and holydays, at 3 p.m.

Mary, St., Islington—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.;

- and on Saturdays and holydays, at 3 p.m.
- Mary, St., Lambeth—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at half-past 10 a.m.; Saturday, at 3 p.m.; every day in Lent, at 11 a.m. Holy Com. Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, and other solemnities, besides the regular.
- Mary Magdalen, St., Bermondsey—Daily, at 11 a.m. Holy Com. twice on all holydays which fall on the 1st Sunday, and Christmas day, Easter day, and Whitsunday.
- Mary Magdalen, St., Old Fish-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.; and on Saturdays in Lent, at 3 p.m.
- Mary, St., Newington Butts—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holy and public days, at 11 a.m.
- Mary, St., Rotherhithe—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, and Saturdays before Communion, at 11 a.m. Holy Com. 2nd Sunday.
- Mary, St., le-Savoy—Daily, at 8. 7, W. 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.; on Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, again at 10 a.m. Holy Com. 1st Sunday, twice, 7 and 12.
- Mary, St., Somerset—Holy and public days, at 11 a.m.
- Mary, St., Whitechapel—Wednesdays, Fridays, holy and public days, at 11 a.m.; Saturdays at 3 p.m. Holy Com. every Sunday, all holydays, Monday and Tuesday in Easter week, Easter day, Whitsunday, Good Friday, Christmas day, Ash Wednesday.
- Mary, St., Woolnoth—Daily, at 11 a.m., and 5 p.m.
- Matthew, St., Friday-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, holy and public days, at 10 a.m. Holy Com. 1st Sunday twice, on all holy days at 10.
- Michael, St., Basinghall—Wednesdays, Fridays, holy and public days, at 11 a.m.; daily, at 5 p.m.
- Michael, St., Cornhill—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holy and public days, at 11 a.m.
- Michael, St., Crooked-lane—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holy and public days, at 11 a.m.
- Michael, St., Queenhithe—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holy and public days, at 11 a.m.; daily, at 6 p.m.
- Michael, St., Royal—Wednesdays and Saturdays, at 11 a.m., and 3 p.m.
- Michael, St., Wood-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.
- Mildred, St., Bread-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.
- Mildred, St., Poultry—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.
- New Chapel, Westminster—Daily, at 9 a.m., and 3, 4, and 5 p.m., as the days lengthen.
- Newgate Chapel—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 10 a.m.; during the eight sessions, daily, at 10 a.m., and 3 p.m.
- Nicholas, St., Coleabby—Wednesdays, Fridays, holy and state days, at 11 a.m.
- Olave, St., Hart-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holy and state days, at 11 a.m., Saturdays in Lent, at 3 p.m.
- Olave, St., Jewry—Holy and public days, and on Wednesdays and Fridays, from October to May, at 11 a.m.
- Olave, St., Southwark—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holy and public days, at 11 a.m.; Saturdays, at 3 p.m.
- Oxenden Chapel, Haymarket—Daily, at 10 a.m. No communion.
- Palmer's, Mrs., Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m.
- Paul's, St., Cathedral—Daily, at 8, 6, W. 7, and 11 a.m., and 3 p.m. Holy Communion every Sunday.
- Paul, St., Covent Garden—Daily, 8, 6, W. 7 and 10 a.m. and 3 and 6 p.m. Holy Com. 1st and 3rd Sundays in the month, and other occasions.
- Paul, St., Shadwell—Daily, at 11 a.m.; S. 6, W. 3 p.m.
- Pest House Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m., and 3 p.m.
- Peter, St., Cornhill—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 4 p.m. Holy Com. every Sunday.
- Peter, St., Chapel, St. Peter's Hospital—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays. N.B. The keeper of the hospital reads till means can be provided to support a minister.
- Peter, St., Poor, Broad-street—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.
- Peter, St., in the Tower—Wednes-

- days, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.
- Peter, St., *alias* Westminster Abbey—Daily, at S. 6, W. 7, and 10 a.m. and 3 p.m.
- Poplar Chapel—Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays, at 11 a.m. Holy Com. 3rd Sunday, at 1 p.m.
- Prison of Queen's Bench Chapel—Daily, at 7 a.m.
- Queen's Square Chapel, Westminster—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 4 p.m. in winter; only on Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays in the summer; but evenings always.
- Queen's-street, Great, Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 4 p.m. Holy Com. last Sunday in the month.
- The Rolls Chapel—Holydays, at 10 a.m., and 3 p.m. Holy Com. 7 times a year.
- Saviour, St., or St. Mary's Overie, Southwark—Wednesdays, Fridays, holy and public days, at 11 a.m.
- Sepulchre, St., Snow-hill—Daily, at S. 6, W. 7, a.m., and S. 3, W. 4 p.m.; on Wednesdays, Fridays, holy and public days again, at 11 a.m. Holy Com. 1st Sunday, and every Sunday from Easter to Trinity.
- Skinner's Alms-house Chapel, Mile End—Daily, at 11 a.m.
- Somerset House Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m., and 4 p.m. Holy Com. 3rd Sunday in the month.
- Stephen, St., Coleman-street—Daily, at 11 a.m. Holy Communion every Sunday.
- Stephen, St., Walbrook—Daily, at 11 a.m.; and on Saturdays in Lent at 4 p.m.
- Stratford-le-Bow—Wednesdays, Fridays, holy and state days at 11 a.m.
- Swithine, St., Cannon-street—Daily, at 11 a.m. and 5 p.m.
- Temple Church—Daily, at 8, or 7, or 9 a.m. and 4 p.m.
- Thomas, St., Southwark—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m. Holy Com. 2d Sunday.
- Thomas, St., Hospital Chapel—Daily, at 3 p.m.
- Trinity Chapel, Bond-street—Daily, at 11 a.m., and 3 p.m. Holy Com. 3rd Sunday.
- Trinity in the little Minories—Holy and public days, and in Lent on Wednesdays and Fridays, at 11 a.m.
- Vedast, or St. Foster—Wednesdays, Fridays, and holydays, at 11 a.m.; evening, daily, at 6 p.m.
- Vintners' Alms-houses Chapel—Wednesdays, Fridays, holy, and public days, at 11 a.m.
- Whitehall Chapel—Daily, at 11 a.m., and 5 p.m. Holy Com. privately every Sunday, but publicly on the 1st Sunday.

These Tracts are continued in Numbers, and sold at the price of 2d. for each sheet, or 7s. for 50 copies.

LONDON: PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1838.

The following Works, all in single volumes, or pamphlets, and recently published, will be found more or less to uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in these Tracts :—

Bp. Taylor on Repentance, by Hale.—*Rivingtons.*

Bp. Taylor's Golden Grove.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, with translation.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Pusey on Cathedrals and Clerical Education.—*Roake & Varty.*

Hook's University Sermons.—*Talboys, Oxford.*

Pusey on Baptism (*published separately*).—*Rivingtons.*

Newman's Sermons, 3 vols.—*Rivingtons.*

Newman on Romanism, &c.—*Rivingtons.*

The Christian Year.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Lyra Apostolica.—*Rivingtons.*

Perceval on the Roman Schism.—*Leslie.*

Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions.—*Duncan.*

Dodsworth's Lectures on the Church.—*Burns.*

Newman on Suffragan Bishops.—*Rivingtons.*

Keble's Sermon on Tradition.—*Rivingtons.*

Memoir of Ambrose Bonwick.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer.—*Rivingtons.*

Law's first and second Letters to Hoadly.—*Rivingtons.*

Bp. Andrews' Devotions. Latin and Greek.—*Pickering.*

Hook's Family Prayers.—*Rivingtons.*

Herbert's Poems and Country Pastor.

Evans's Scripture Biography.—*Rivingtons.*

Le Bas' Life of Archbishop Laud.—*Rivingtons.*

Jones (of Nayland) on the Church.

Bp. Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration.—*Rivingtons.*

Bp. Beveridge's Sermons on the Ministry and Ordinances.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Bp. Jolly on the Eucharist.

Fulford's Sermons on the Ministry, &c.—*Rivingtons.*

Rose's Sermons on the Ministry.—*Rivingtons*.
A Catechism on the Church.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Russell's Judgment of the Anglican Church.—*Baily*.
Poole's Sermons on the Creed.—*Grant, Edinburgh*.
Sutton on the Eucharist.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Leslie on the Regale and Pontificate.—*Leslie*.
Pusey's Sermon on November 5.—*Rivingtons*.
Bishop Wilson's *Sacra Privata*.—*Parker, Oxford*.

Larger Works which may be profitably studied.

Bishop Bull's Sermons.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Bishop Bull's Works.—*University Press*.
Waterland's Works.—*Do*.
Wall on Infant Baptism.—*Do*.
Pearson on the Creed.—*Do*.
Leslie's Works.—*Do*.
Bingham's Works.—*Straker, London*.
Palmer on the Liturgy.—*University Press*.
Palmer on the Church.—*Rivingtons*.
Hooker, ed. Keble.—*Do*.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

PART I.

LECTURES ON THE SCRIPTURE PROOF OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH.

LECTURE I.

DIFFICULTIES IN THE SCRIPTURE PROOF OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH.

I PROPOSE in the following Lectures to suggest some thoughts by way of answering an objection, which often presses on the mind of those who are inquiring into the claims of the Church, and the truth of that system of doctrine which it especially represents, which is at once her trust and her charter. They hear much stress laid upon a certain system of doctrine; they see much that is beautiful in it, much that is plausible in the proof advanced for it, much which is agreeable to the analogy of nature, which bespeaks the hand of the CREATOR, and is suitable to the need and expectations of the creature,—much that is deep, much that is large and free, fearless in its course, sure in its stepping, and singularly true, consistent, entire, harmonious in its adjustments; but they seem to ask for more rigid proof in behalf of the simple elementary propositions on which it rests; or in other words, by way of speaking more clearly, and as a chief illustration of what is meant (though it is not the same thing), let me say, they desire more adequate and explicit *Scripture proof* of its truth. They find the proof to be *rested* on Scripture, and therefore they require more explicit *Scripture proof*. They say, “All this that you say about the Church is very specious, and very attractive; but where is it to be found in the

inspired volume?" And that it is *not* found there (that is, I mean not found as fully as it might be), seems to them proved at once by the simple fact, that *all* persons (as I may say, for the exceptions are very few),—*all* those who try to go by Scripture only, fall away from the Church and her doctrines, to one or other sect or party, as if showing that whatever is or is not scriptural, at least the Church, by consent of all men, is not so.

I am stating no rare or novel objection : it is one which (I suppose) all of us have felt, or perhaps feel : it is one which, before now (I do not scruple to say), I have much felt myself, and that without being able satisfactorily to answer : one which I believe to be one of the main difficulties, and (as I think) one of the intended difficulties which God's Providence puts at this day in the path of those who seek Him as He would have them, for purposes known or unknown, ascertainable or not. Nor am I at all sanguine that I shall be able, in what I shall say, to present any thing like a full view of the difficulty itself, even as a phenomenon ; which different minds feel differently, and do not quite recognize as their own when stated by another, and which it is difficult to bring out even according to one's own idea of it. Much less shall I be able to assign it its due *place* in that system which nevertheless I hold to be true, and in which it is *but* a difficulty. I do not profess to be about to account for it, reconcile it, and dismiss it as a thing which was in a man's way, but is henceforth behind him ;—yet, subdued as my hopes may be, I have too great confidence in that glorious Creed, which I believe to have been once delivered to the Saints, to wish in any degree to deny the difficulty, or be unfair to it, to smooth it over, misrepresent it, or defraud it of its due weight and extent. Though I were to grant that the champions of Israel have not yet rescued this portion of the sacred territory from the Philistine, its usurping occupant, yet was not Jerusalem in the bonds of the Jebusites till David's time ? and shall I, seeing with my eyes and enjoying the land of promise, be over-troubled with one objection, which stands unvanquished (supposing it), and, like haughty Haman, count the King's favour as nothing till I have all my own way, and nothing to try me ? In plain terms, I conceive I have most

abundant evidence given me of the divine origin of the Church system: how then is that evidence which *is* given, *not* given, because *though* given in Scripture, it might be given *more explicitly and fully*, and (if I may so say) more consistently?

One consideration alone must create an anxiety in entering on the subject I propose. It is this:—Those who commonly make this objection which is to be considered, viz. the want of *adequate* Scripture evidence for the Church doctrines, have, I feel sure, no right to make it; that is, *they are inconsistent* in making it; for they cannot consistently object against a person who believes more than they do, unless they cease to believe so much as they do believe. They ought, on their own principles, to doubt or disown much which happily they do not doubt or disown. This then is the direct, appropriate, polemical answer to them, or (as it is called) an *argumentum ad hominem*. “Look at home, and say, if you can, *why* you believe this or that, which you do believe: whatever reasons you give for your own belief in one, we can give for our belief in the other. If you are reasonable in believing the one, so are we in believing the other. Either we are reasonable, or you are not so. You ought not to stand where you are; you ought to go further one way or the other.” Now it is plain, that if this be a sound argument against our assailants, it is a most convincing one; and it is obviously very hard and very unfair if we are to be deprived the use of it. And yet a cautious mind will ever use it with anxiety, not that it is not most effective, but that it may be (as it were) too effective, it may drive the parties in question the wrong way, and make things worse instead of better. It only undertakes to show that they are *inconsistent* in their present opinions; and from this inconsistency it is plain they can escape, by going further either one way or the other,—by adding to their creed, or by abandoning it altogether. It is then what is familiarly called a kill or cure remedy. Certainly it is better to be inconsistent than consistently wrong,—to hold some truth amid error, than to hold nothing but error,—to believe than to doubt. Yet when I show a man that he is inconsistent, I make him decide whether of the two he loves better, the portion of truth he already holds, or the portion of error. If

he loves the truth better, he will abandon the error; if the error, he will abandon the truth. And this is a fearful and anxious trial to put him under, and one cannot but feel loth to have recourse to it. One feels that perchance it may be better to keep silence, and to allow him, in shallowness and presumption, to assail oneself, than to retort, however justly, his weapons on himself;—better for oneself to seem a bigot, than to make him a scoffer. Thus, for instance, a person who denies the Apostolical Succession of the Ministry, because it is not clearly taught in Scripture, ought, I conceive, if consistent, to deny the Godhead of the HOLY GHOST, which is nowhere literally stated in Scripture. Yet there is something so dreadful in his denying the latter, that one may often feel afraid to show him his inconsistency, lest, rather than admit the Apostolical Succession, he should consent to do so. This is one of the great delicacies of disputing on the subject before us: yet, all things considered, I think, it only avails to the cautious use, not the abandonment, of the argument in question. For it is our plain duty to preach and defend the truth in a straightforward way. Those who are to stumble must stumble, rather than the heirs of grace should not hear. While we offend and alienate one man, we secure another; if we drive one man further the wrong way, we drive another further the right way. The cause of truth, the heavenly company of saints, gains on the whole more in the one way than the other. A wavering or shallow mind does perhaps as much harm to others as a mind consistent in error, nay, is in no very much better state itself; for if it has not developed into systematic scepticism merely because it has not had the temptation, its present conscientiousness is not worth much. Whereas he who is at present obeying God under imperfect knowledge has a claim on His Ministers for their doing their part towards his obtaining further knowledge. He who admits the doctrine of the Trinity, in spite of feeling its difficulties, whether in itself or in its proof—who submits to the indirectness of the Scripture evidence on which it rests, has a right to be told those doctrines concerning the Church, which are as certainly declared in Scripture, yet not more directly and prominently, and which will be as welcome to him when known, as those which he already knows. It is there-

fore one's duty to leave the event to God, begging Him to bless, yet aware that, whenever He visits, He divides.

In saying this, I by no means would imply that the only argument in behalf of our believing more than the generality of men now do, is, that else we ought in consistency to believe less,—far from it indeed; but this argument is the one that comes first, and is the most obvious and the most striking. Nor do I mean to say,—far from it also,—that all on whom it is urged, *will* in fact go one way or the other; the many will remain pretty much where education and habit have placed them, and at least will not confess that they are affected by any new argument at all. But of course when one speaks of anxiety about the effect of a certain argument, one speaks of cases where it *has* effect, not where it *has not*. Where it *has* effect, I say, that effect may be for good or for evil, and that it is an anxious thing.

Now then, first, let me state the objection itself, which is to be considered. It may be thrown into one or other of the following forms: that “if Scripture laid such stress, as we do, upon the doctrines of Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Church Union, Ministerial Power, Apostolical Succession, Absolution and other rites and ceremonies,—upon external, or what is sometimes called formal religion,—it would not in its general tenour make such merely indirect mention of them;—that it would speak of them as plainly and frequently as we now always speak of them; whereas every one must allow that there is next to nothing on the surface of Scripture about them, and very little even under the surface of a satisfactory character.” Descending into particulars, we shall have it granted us, perhaps, that Baptism is often mentioned in the Epistles, and its spiritual benefits; but “its peculiarity as the *one plenary* remission of sin,” it will be urged, “is not insisted on with such frequency and earnestness as might be expected,—chiefly in one or two passages of one Epistle, and there obscurely” (in Heb. vi. and x.). Again, “the doctrine of Absolution is made to rest on but one or two texts (in Matt. xvi. and John xx.), with little or no practical exemplification of it in the Epistles, where it was to be expected. Why,” it may be asked, “are not the Apostles continually urging their converts to

rid themselves of sin after Baptism, as best they can, by penance, confession, absolution, satisfaction? Again, why are CHRIST's ministers no where called Priests? or at most, in one or two obscure passages (as in Rom. xv.)? Why is not the LORD's Supper expressly said to be a Sacrifice? why is the LORD's Table called an Altar but once or twice (Matt. v. and Heb. xiii.), even granting these passages refer to it? why is consecration of the elements expressly mentioned only in one passage (1 Cor. x.) in addition to our LORD's original institution of them? why is there but once or twice express mention made at all of the LORD's Supper, all through the New Testament, and what there is, chiefly in the same Epistle? why is there so little said about Ordination? about the appointment of a Succession of Ministers? about the visible Church (1 Tim. iii. 15.)? why but one or two passages on the duty of fasting? In short, is not (it may be asked) the state of the evidence for all these doctrines just this, — a few striking texts at most scattered up and down the inspired volume, or one or two particular passages of one particular epistle, or a number of texts which *may* mean, but need not mean, what they are said by Churchmen to mean, which say something *looking like* what is needed, but with little strength and point, inadequately and unsatisfactorily? Why then are we thus to be put off? why is our earnest desire of getting at the truth to be trifled with? is it conceivable that, if these doctrines were from God, He would not tell us plainly? why does He make us to doubt? why does He keep us in suspense¹? it is impossible it should be so. Let us, then, have none of these expedients, these makeshift arguments, this patchwork system, these surmises and conjectures, and here a little and there a little, but give us some broad, trustworthy, masterly view of doctrine, give us some plain intelligible interpretation of the sacred text, such as will approve itself to all educated minds, as being really gained from the text, and not from previous notions which are merely brought to Scripture, and seek to find a sanction in it. Such a broad comprehensive view of the sacred volume would most assuredly be fatal to the Church doctrines.

¹ ψυχὴν αἰρεῖς. John x. 24.

But this (it will be urged) is not all; there are texts in the New Testament actually inconsistent with that system. For example, what can be stronger against the sanctity of particular places, nay of any institutions, persons, or rites, than our LORD's declaration, that God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth? or against the Eucharistic Sacrifice, than St. Paul's contrast in Heb. x. between the Jewish sacrifices and the one Christian Atonement? or can Baptism really have the gifts which are attributed to it in the Catholic or Church system, considering how St. Paul says, that all rites are done away, and that faith is all in all?"—Such is the sort of objection which it is proposed now to consider.

Now, in what remains of this Lecture I shall but briefly draw out the *argumentum ad hominem* I have alluded to, or in other words, show that the argument in question proves too much for the purposes of those who use it; that it leads to conclusions beyond those to which they would confine it; and if it tells for any thing, tells for much which they repudiate.

Now the argument in question proves too much, first, in this way, that it shows that external religion is not only not important or necessary, but not allowable. If, for instance, where our SAVIOUR said, "Woman, believe Me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. The hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship Him: God is a spirit, and they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth¹," if He means that the external local worship of the Jews was so to be abolished that no external local worship should again be enjoined, that the Gospel worship was but *mental*, stripped of every thing material or sensible, and offered in that simple spirit and truth which exists in heaven,—if so, it is plain that all external religion is not only not *imperative* under the Gospel, but *forbidden*. This text, if it avails for any thing against Sacraments and Ordinances, avails entirely; it cuts them away root and branch. It says not that they are not important, but that

¹ John iv. 21—24.

they are not to be. It does not leave them at our option. Any interpretation which gives an opening to their existing, gives so far an opening to their being important. If the command to worship in spirit and truth is consistent with the permission to worship through certain rites, it is consistent with the duty to worship through them. Why are *we* to have a greater freedom (if I may so speak) than God Himself? why are *we* to choose what rites we please to worship in, and not *God* choose them? as if spirituality consisted, not in doing without rites altogether, (a notion which at least is intelligible,) but in our forestalling our LORD and MASTER in the choice of them. Let us take the text to mean that there shall be no external worship at all, if we will (we shall be wrong, but we shall speak fairly and intelligibly); but, if there may be times, places, ministers, ordinances of worship, though the text speaks of worshipping in spirit and in truth, what is there in it to negative the notion of God having *chosen* those times, places, ministers, and ordinances, so that if *we* attempt to choose, we shall commit the very fault of the Jews, who were ever setting up golden calves, planting groves, or consecrating ministers without authority of God?

And what has been observed of this text, holds good of all arguments drawn, whether from the silence about, or the supposed positive statements of Scripture, against, the rites and ordinances of the Church. If obscurity of texts, for instance, about the grace of the Eucharist be taken as a proof that no *great* benefit is therein given, it is an argument against there being any benefit. On the other hand, when certain texts are once determined to refer to it, the emphatic language used, when it is spoken of, shows that the benefit is not small. We cannot say the subject is unimportant, without saying it is not mentioned. Either no gift is given in the Eucharist, or a great gift. If only the 6th of St. John, for instance, does allude to its benefit, it shows it is not merely an edifying rite, but an awful communication beyond words. Again, if the phrase of "the communication of the body of Christ," used by St. Paul, means any gift, it means a great one. You *may* say it does not mean any gift, only a representation or figure of the communication; this I call explaining away, but still it is intelligible; but I do not see how, if it

is to be taken literally as a real *communication*, it can be other than a communication of *His Body*. Again, though the Lord's Table be but twice called an Altar in Scripture, yet granting that it is meant in those passages, it is spoken of so solemnly, that it matters not though it be no where else spoken of. "We have an Altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." We do not know of the existence of the ordinance except in the knowledge of its importance; and in corroboration and explanation of this matter of fact, let it be well observed that St. Paul expressly declares that the Jewish rites are not to be practised because they *are not* important.

This is one way in which this argument proves too much: so that they who for the sake of decency or edification, or from an imaginative turn of mind, delight in ordinances, yet think they may make them for themselves, in that they bring no special blessing with them, these as plainly will contradict the Gospel as those who attribute a mystical virtue to them, nay more so; for if any truth is clear, it is that such ordinances as are without virtue are abolished by the Gospel, this being the exact case of the Jewish rites.

Now as to the other point of view in which the argument in question proves too much for the purpose of those who use it:—If it be a good argument against the truth of the Apostolical Succession and similar doctrines, that so little is said about them in Scripture, this is quite as good an argument against nearly all the doctrines which are held by any who is called a Christian in any sense of the word; as a few instances will show.

First, as to Ordinances. There is not a single text in the Bible enjoining infant baptism: the Scripture warrant on which we baptize infants, consists of inferences carefully made from various texts. How is it St. Paul does not in his Epistles remind parents of so great a duty, if it is a duty?

Again, there is not a single text telling us to keep holy the first day of the week, and that *instead* of the seventh. God hallowed the seventh day, yet we now observe the first. Why do we do this? Our Scripture warrant for doing so is such as this: "*since* the Apostles met on the first day of the week, *therefore* the first day is to be hallowed; and *since* St. Paul says the Sabbath is

abolished, *therefore* the seventh day (which is the Sabbath) is not to be hallowed:"—this is a true inference, but very indirect surely. It is not on the surface of Scripture. We might infer, though incorrectly still we *might* infer, that St. Paul meant that the command in the second of Genesis was repealed, and that now there is no sacred day at all in the seven, though meetings for prayer are right on Sunday. There is nothing on the surface of Scripture to prove that the *sacredness* conferred in the beginning on the seventh day now *by transference* attaches to the first.

Again, there is scarcely a text enjoining going to Church for joint worship. St. Paul happens in one place of his Epistle to the Hebrews, to warn us against forgetting to assemble together for prayer. Our Saviour says that where two or three are gathered together, He is in the midst of them; yet this alludes in the first instance not to public worship, but to Church councils and censures, quite a distinct subject. And in the Acts and Epistles we meet with instances or precepts in favour of joint worship; yet there is nothing express to show that it is necessary for *all* times,—nothing more express than there is to show that in 1 Cor. vii. St. Paul meant that an unmarried state is better at all times,—nothing which does not need collecting and inferring with minute carefulness to Scripture. The first disciples *did* pray together, and so in like manner the first disciples *did not* marry. St. Paul tells them who were in a state of distress to pray together so much the more as they see the day approaching—and he says that celibacy is "*good for the present distress.*" The same remarks might be applied to the question of community of goods. On the other hand, our Lord did not use social prayer: even when with His disciples He prayed by Himself, and His directions in Matt. vi. about *private* prayer, with the silence which He observes about *public*, might be as plausibly adduced as an argument against public, as the same kind of silence in Scripture concerning turning to the east, or making the sign of the Cross, or concerning commemorations for the dead in Christ, accompanied with its warnings against formality and ceremonial abuses, is urged as an argument against these latter usages.

Again:—there is no text in Scripture which enjoins us to

"establish" religion (as the phrase is), or to make it national and give the Church certain honour and power; whereas our Lord's words, "My kingdom is not of this world," (John xviii. 36.) may be interpreted to discountenance such a proceeding. We consider that it is right to establish the Church on the ground of mere deductions, though of course true ones, from the sacred text; such as St. Paul's using his rights as a Roman citizen.

There is no text which allows us to take oaths. The words of CHRIST and St. James seem plainly the other way. Why then do we take them? We *infer* that it is allowable from finding that St. Paul uses such expressions as "I call God for a record upon my soul"—"the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not" (2 Cor. i. 23; Gal. i. 20.); these we *argue*, and rightly, are equivalent to an oath.

Again, considering God has said, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," it seems a very singular power which we give to the Civil Magistrate to take away life. It ought to rest, one might suppose, on some very clear permission given in Scripture. Now, on what does it rest? on one or two words of an Apostle casually introduced into Scripture, as far as anything is casual; on St. Paul's saying in a parenthesis, "he (the magistrate) *beareth not* the sword in vain;" and he is speaking of a *heathen* magistrate, *not* of a Christian.

Again:—On how many texts does the prohibition of polygamy depend, if we set about counting them?

Next, consider how Doctrine will stand, if the said rule of interpretation is to hold.

If the Lord's Supper is never distinctly called a Sacrifice, or Christian ministers never called Priests, still, let me ask, (as I have already done,) is the Holy Ghost ever expressly called God in Scripture? No where; we infer it from what *is* said; we compare parallel passages.

If the words Altar, Absolution, or Succession, are not in Scripture (supposing it), neither is the word Trinity.

Again: how do we know that the New Testament is inspired? does it *any* where declare this of itself? no where; *how*, then, do we know it? we infer it from the circumstance that the office

of the Apostles who wrote it was what it was, and from the Old Testament being inspired.

Again : whence do Protestants gain their common notion, that every one may gain his faith from Scripture for himself ?

Again : consider whether the doctrine of the Atonement may not be explained away by those who explain away the doctrine of the Eucharist : if the expressions used concerning the latter are merely figurative, so may be those of the former.

Again : on how many texts does the doctrine of original sin rest, that is, the doctrine that we are individually born under God's displeasure, in consequence of the sin of Adam ? on one or two.

Again : how do we prove the doctrine of justification by faith only ? it is no where declared in Scripture. St. Paul does but speak of justification by faith, not faith only, and St. James actually denies that it is by faith only. Yet we infer, and truly, that there is a correct sense in which it is by faith only ; though an Apostle has in so many words said the contrary. Is any Church doctrine, about the power of Absolution, the Christian Priesthood, or the danger of sin after Baptism, so disadvantageously circumstanced in point of evidence as this ?

On the whole then, I ask, on *how many* special or palmary texts do any of the doctrines or rites we hold depend ? what doctrines or rites would be left to us, if we demanded the clearest and fullest evidence, before we believed any thing ? what would the Gospel consist of ? would there be any revelation at all left ? Some all-important doctrines indeed at first sight would remain, such as the divinity of CHRIST, the unity of God, and the supremacy of divine grace, and our election in CHRIST, and the resurrection of the body, and eternal life or death to the righteous or sinners ; but little besides. Shall we give up the divinity of the Holy Ghost, original sin, the Atonement, the inspiration of the New Testament, united worship, the Sacraments, and infant baptism ? Let us do so. Well :—I will venture to say that *then* we shall find difficulties as regards those other doctrines, as the divinity of CHRIST, which I have described as remaining ; they are only clearer *than* the others, not so clearly stated as to be secured from specious objections. We shall have difficulties

about the *meaning* of the word "everlasting," as applied to punishment, about the *compatibility* of divine grace with free-will, about the *possibility* of the resurrection of the body, and about the *sense* in which CHRIST is God. The mind which rejects a doctrine which has but one text in its favour, on the ground that if it were important, it would have more, can, where a doctrine is mentioned often, always find occasion to wonder that it is *not* mentioned in this or that particular place, where it might be expected. When it is pressed with such a text as St. Thomas's confession, "My LORD and my God," it will ask, But why does our LORD say but seven days before to St. Mary Magdalen, "I ascend to My Father and your Father, to My God and your God?" When, with St. Peter's confession, "LORD, Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love Thee," it will ask, But why does CHRIST say of Himself, that He does not know the last day, only the Father? Indeed, the more arguments there are for a doctrine in Scripture, the more objections will be found against it; so that on the whole, I think, even the Scripture evidence for the divinity of CHRIST, will be found in fact as little to satisfy the captious mind, when fairly engaged to discuss it, as that for infant baptism, great as is the difference between the evidence for the two. And the history of these last centuries bears out this remark.

I conclude, then, that there must be some fault *somewhere* in this specious argument; that it does *not* follow that a doctrine or rite is not divine because it is not clearly stated in Scripture; that there are some wise and unknown reasons for doctrines being, as they are, not clearly stated there. To be sure, I might take the other alternative, and run the full length of scepticism, denying that any thing is divine, whatever it is, which is not spoken of in Scripture beyond all contradiction and objection. But for many reasons I cannot get myself to do this, as I shall proceed to show in future Lectures.

LECTURE II.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF LATITUDINARIANISM.

No one, I think, will seriously maintain, that any other definite religious *system* is laid down in Scripture at all more clearly than the Church system. It may be maintained, and speciously, that the Church system is not there, or that this or that *particular doctrine* of some other system seems to be there more plainly than the corresponding Church doctrine; but that Presbyterianism as a whole, or Independency as a whole, or the religion of Lutherans, Baptists, Wesleyans, or Friends, as a whole, is more clearly laid down in it, and with fewer texts looking the other way,—that any of these has less difficulties to encounter than the Creed of the Church,—I do not think can successfully be maintained. The arguments which are used to prove that the Church system is not in Scripture, may as cogently be used to prove that no system is in Scripture. If silence in Scripture, or apparent contrariety, is an argument against the Church system, it is an argument against system at all. No system is on the surface of Scripture; none, but has at times to account for the silence or the apparent opposition of Scripture as to particular portions of it. This, then, is the choice of conclusions to which we are brought :—*either* Christianity contains no definite message, creed, revelation, system, or whatever other name we call it, nothing which can be made the subject of belief at all; *or*, though there is a true creed or system (whatever it is), yet it is not on the surface of Scripture, but contained in a latent form within it, and to be maintained only by indirect arguments, by comparison of texts, by inferences from what is said plainly, and by overcoming or resigning oneself to difficulties; *or*, though there is a true creed or system revealed, it is *not* in Scripture, but to be gained collaterally from other sources. I wish persons to consider this statement steadily. I do not see that it can be disputed; and if

not, it is very important. I repeat it; we have a choice of three conclusions. Either there is *no* definite religious information given us in Christianity at all, or it is given in Scripture in an *indirect* and covert way, or it is given, but *not* in Scripture. The first is the Latitudinarian view which has gained ground in this day; the second is our own received ground; the third is the ground of the Roman Church. If then we will not content ourselves with merely probable, or (what we may be disposed to call) insufficient proofs of matters of faith and worship, we must become either utter Latitudinarians or Papists. If we will not submit to the notion of the doctrines of the Gospel being hidden under the text of Scripture from the view of the chance reader, we must submit to believe that there are no doctrines at all, or that the doctrines are not in Scripture, but elsewhere, as in Tradition. I know of no other alternative.

Many men, indeed, will attempt to find a fourth way, thus: they would fain discern one or two doctrines in Scripture clearly, and no more; or some generalized form, yet not so much as a *body* of doctrine of any character. They consider that a certain message, consisting of *one* or *two* great and simple statements, makes up the whole of the Gospel, and that these *are* plainly in Scripture; accordingly that he who holds and acts upon these is a Christian, and ought to be acknowledged by all to be such, for in holding these, he holds all that is necessary. These statements they sometimes call the essentials, the peculiar doctrines, the vital doctrines, the leading idea, the great truths of the Gospel,—and all this sounds very well; but when we come to realize what is abstractedly so plausible, we are met by this insurmountable difficulty, that no great number of persons agree together what *are* these great truths, single views, leading idea, or peculiar doctrines of the Gospel. Some say that the doctrine of the Atonement is the leading idea; some, the doctrine of spiritual influence; some, that both together are the peculiar doctrines; some, that love is all in all; some, that the acknowledgment that Jesus is the CHRIST; and some, that the resurrection from the dead is after all the essence of the Gospel, and all that need be believed. Moreover, since, as all parties must confess,

the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity is not brought out in form upon the surface of Scripture, it follows either that it is not part of the leading idea, or that the leading idea is not on the surface. And if the doctrine of the Trinity is not to be accounted as one of the leading or fundamental truths of revelation, the keystone of the mysterious system is lost; and that being lost, mystery will, in matter of fact, be found gradually to fade away from the creed altogether; that is, the notion of Christianity as being a revelation of *new* truths, will gradually fade away, and the Gospel will be considered in course of time scarcely more than the republication of the law of nature. This, I think, will be found to be the historical course and issue of this line of thought. If we will have it so, that the doctrines of Scripture should be on the surface of Scripture, though I may have my very definite notion what doctrines *are* on the surface, and you yours, and another his, yet you and he and I, though in appearance competent to judge, though serious, earnest, and possessed of due attainments, shall not agree together *what* those doctrines are; so that, practically, what I have said will come about in the end,—that (if we are candid) we shall be forced to allow, that there is no system, no creed, no doctrine at all lucidly and explicitly set forth in Scripture; and if we will not seek it under the surface, we must either give up seeking it, or seek it in Tradition,—we must become Latitudinarians or Romanists.

Now of these alternatives, Romanism or Latitudinarianism, the latter I do really conceive to be quite out of the question with every serious mind. The Latitudinarian doctrine is this: that every man's view of revealed religion is acceptable to God, if he acts up to it; that no one view is in itself better than another, or at least that we cannot tell which is the better. All we have to do then is to act consistently with what we hold, and to value others if they act consistently with what they hold; that to be consistent constitutes sincerity; that where there is this evident sincerity, it is no matter whether we profess to be Romanists or Protestants, Catholics or Heretics, Calvinists or Arminians, Anglicans or Dissenters, High Churchmen or Puritans, Episcopalians or Independents, Wesleyans or Socinians. Such seems

to be the doctrine of Latitude. Now, I *can* conceive such a view of the subject to be maintainable, supposing God had given us no revelation,—though even then, by the way, and were we even left to the light of nature, belief in His existence and moral government would, one should think, at least be necessary to please Him. “He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them which diligently seek Him¹.” But however, not to press this point, one may conceive that, *before* God had actually spoken to us, He *might* accept as sufficient, a sincere acting on whatever religious opinions; but that after a revelation is given, there is nothing to believe, nothing (to use an expressive Scripture word) to *hold*, to *hold fast*, that a message comes from God, and contains no subject matter, or, that containing it (as it must do), it is not important to be received, and is not capable of being learned by any one who takes the proper means of learning it, that there is nothing in it such, that we may depend on our own impression of it, feel we have really gained something, and continue in the same opinion about it,—all this is so extravagant, that I really cannot enter into the state of mind of a person so maintaining it. I think he is not aware what he is saying. Why should God speak, unless He meant to say something? Why should He say it, unless He meant us to hear? Why should we be made to hear, if it mattered not whether we accepted it or no? *What* the doctrine is, is another and distinct question; yet that there is *some* doctrine revealed, and that it is revealed in order that it may be received, and that it really *is* revealed, that it is not hidden, so as to be a mere matter of opinion, a chance what is true and what not, or as if there were a number of opposite modes of holding it, one as good as another, but that it is plain in one and the same substantial sense to all who sincerely and suitably seek for it, and that God is better pleased when we hold it than when we do not,—all this seems a truism. *Where* it is given us, whether entirely in Scripture, or partly elsewhere, this again is another and secondary question; though that it is given somewhere cannot be denied

¹ Heb. xi. 6.

surely without some eccentricity or confusion of mind, or some want of seriousness and candour. When then we once decide that there is some essential doctrine proposed to our faith, the question at once follows, *what* is it, and *how much*, and *where*? and we are forthwith involved in *researches* of some kind or other, somewhere or other; for the doctrine is not written on the sun.

For reasons such as the above, I really cannot conceive a serious man, who realized what he was speaking about, a consistent Latitudinarian. He always will reserve from the general proscription his own favourite doctrine, whatever it is; and then holding it, he will be at once forced into the difficulty which is ours also, but which he would fain make ours and not his, that of stating clearly what this doctrine of his is, and what are those grounds of it, such as to enable him to take in just so much of dogmatic teaching and nothing more, to hold so much firmly, and to treat all the rest as comparatively unimportant.

Revelation implies a something revealed, and what is revealed is imperative on our faith, *because* it is revealed. Revelation implies imperativeness; it limits in its very notion our liberty of *thought*, because it limits our liberty of *error*, for error is one kind of thought.

But now, putting aside abstract considerations, let us turn to the *fact* which is urged in behalf of Latitudinarianism. The doctrine, then, that it matters not what you believe, so that you act up to what you believe, is grounded (it would seem) on this alleged fact, that no one creed of any sort can be surely gathered from Scripture,—that the divine message, the whole counsel of God, is not there. “Whichever view of religion you fix upon (it is said), there are parts of it which, by a candid, dispassionate, unprejudiced observer, will be pronounced additions to Scripture; *therefore* (it is inferred), there is *no* definite creed or message at all revealed anywhere.” Indeed! Supposing the fact to be as stated (which I do not grant, but supposing it), is this the necessary conclusion? No: there is another. Such an inference indeed as the above is a clever controversial way of settling the matter; it is the sort of answer which, in the schools of disputation or the courts of law, may find a place, where men are

not in earnest ; but it is an answer without a *heart*. It is an excuse for indolence, love of quiet, or worldliness. There is *another* answer. I do not adopt it, I do not see I am driven to it, because I do not allow the premises from which the argument starts. I do not allow that there is no creed at all contained in Scripture, though I grant it is not on the surface. But if there be no divine message, gospel, or creed, *produceable* from Scripture, this would not lead me one iota towards deciding that there was none at all *any where*. No ; it would make me look out of Scripture for it, that is all. If there is a revelation, there must be a doctrine ; both our reason and our hearts tell us so. If it is not in Scripture, it is somewhere else, it is to be sought elsewhere. Should the fact so turn out, (which I deny), that Scripture is so obscure that nothing can be made of it, even when the true interpretation is otherwise given, so obscure that every person will have his own interpretation, and no two alike, this would drive me, not into Latitudinarianism but into Romanism. Yes, and it will drive the multitude of men. It is far more certain that revelation must contain a message, than that that message must be in Scripture. It is a less violence to one's feelings to say that part of it is revealed elsewhere, than to say that nothing is revealed any where. There is an overpowering antecedent improbability in Almighty God's announcing that He has revealed something, and revealing nothing ; there is no antecedent improbability in His revealing it elsewhere than in an inspired volume. And, I say, the mass of mankind will feel it so. It is very well for educated persons, at their ease, with few cares, or in the joyous time of youth, to argue and speculate about the impalpableness and versatility of the divine message, its chameleon-like changeableness, its adaptation to each fresh mind it meets ; but when men are conscious of sin, are sorrowful, are weighed down, are desponding, they ask for something to lean on, something external to themselves. It will not do to tell them that whatever they at present hold as true, is enough. They want to be assured that what seems to them true, is true ; they want something to lean on, holier, diviner, more stable than their own minds. They have an instinctive feeling that there is

an external, eternal truth which is their only stay, and it mocks them, after being told of a revelation, to be assured next that that revelation tells us nothing certain, nothing which we do not know without it, nothing distinct from our own impressions concerning it, whatever they may be,—nothing such as to exist independently of that shape and colour into which our own individual mind happens to throw it. Therefore, practically, those who argue for the vague character of the Scripture informations and the harmlessness of all sorts of religious opinions, do not tend to advance Latitudinarianism one step among the many; they advance Romanism. That truth, which men are told they cannot find in Scripture, they will seek *out* of Scripture. They will never believe, they will never be content with, a religion without doctrines. The common sense of mankind decides against it. Religion cannot but be dogmatic, it ever has been. All religions have had doctrines; all have professed to carry with them benefits which could be enjoyed only on condition of believing the word of a supernatural informant, that is, of embracing some doctrines or other. It is a mere idle sophistical theory, to suppose it can be otherwise. *Destroy* religion, make men give it up, if you can; but while it exists, it will profess an insight into the next world, it will profess *important* information about the next world, it will have points of faith, it will have dogmatism, it will have anathemas. Christianity, therefore, ever will be looked on, by the multitude, as it is, as a rule of faith as well as of conduct. Men may be Presbyterians, or Baptists, or Lutherans, or Calvinists, or Wesleyans; but something or other they will be; a creed, a creed necessary to salvation, they will have; a creed either in Scripture or out of it; and if in Scripture, I say, hidden in Scripture, indirectly gained from Scripture. Latitudinarianism, then, is out of the question; and you have this choice, to be content with indirect proofs *in* Scripture, or to look for tradition *out* of Scripture. You cannot get beyond this; *either* you must take up with us, (or with some system not at all better off, whether Presbyterianism, or Independency, or the like), *or* you must go to Rome. Which will you choose? You may not like us; you may be

impatient and impetuous ; you may go forward, but back you cannot go.

But further, it can scarcely be denied that Scripture, if it does not supply, at least speaks of, refers to, sanctions, recommends some certain doctrine or message which is to be believed in order to salvation ; and which, accordingly, if not found in Scripture, must be sought for out of it. It says, "He who believeth shall be saved, and he who believeth not shall be damned ;" it speaks of "the doctrine of CHRIST," of "keeping the faith," of "the faith once *delivered* to the saints," and of "delivering that which has been received," recounting at the same time some of the articles of the Apostles' Creed. And the case is the same as regards discipline ; rules of worship and order, whether supplied or not, are at least alluded to again and again, under the title of "traditions." Revelation then will be inconsistent with itself, unless it had provided some creed somewhere. For in Scripture it implies it has ; therefore some creed *exists* somewhere, whether in Scripture or out of it.

Nor is this all ; from the earliest times, so early that there is no assignable origin to it short of the Apostles, one definite system *has* existed in the Church both of faith and worship, and that in countries far disjoined from one another, and without any appearance (as far as we can detect) of the existence of any other system any where ; and (what is very remarkable) a system such, that the portion in it which relates to matters of faith (or its philosophy), accurately fits in and corresponds to that which relates to matters of worship and order (or its ceremonial) ; as if they were evidently parts of a whole, and not an accidental assemblage of rites on the one hand, and doctrines on the other ;—a system moreover which has existed ever since, and exists at the present day, and in its great features, as in other branches of the Church, so among ourselves ;—a system moreover which at least *professes* to be quite consistent with and to appeal and defer to the written word, and thus in all respects accurately answers to that which Scripture seems alluding to in the notices above cited. Now, is it possible, with this very significant phenomenon standing in the threshold of Christian history, that a

person can be of opinion that one creed or worship is as good as another? St. Paul speaks of one faith, one baptism, one body; this in itself is a very intelligible hint of his own view of Christianity; but as if to save his words from misinterpretation, here in history is at once a sort of realization of what he seems to allude to. Under these circumstances, what excuse have we for not recognizing in the system of doctrine and worship in question, that system to which the Apostles refer in Scripture? They evidently did not say out in Scripture all they had to say; this is evident on the face of Scripture, evident from what they do say. St. Paul says, "*The rest will I set in order when I come.*" St. John, "I had *many things* to write, but I will not with ink and pen write unto thee; but I trust I shall shortly see thee, and we shall *speak* face to face." This he says in two epistles. Now supposing, to take the case of profane history, a collection of letters was extant by the founders or remodellers of the Platonic or Stoic philosophy, and supposing they in them referred to their philosophy, and treated of it in parts, yet without drawing it out, and then besides, supposing there were other and more direct historical sources of various kinds from which a distinct systematic account of their philosophy might be drawn, one account and but one from many witnesses, should we not take it for granted that this *was* their system, that system of which their letters spoke? Should not we take up that system conveyed to us by history with (I will not say merely an antecedent disposition in its favour, but) with a confidence and certainty that it *was* their system; and if we found discrepancies between it and their letters, should we at once cast it aside as spurious, or rather try to reconcile them, suspect that *we* were in fault, that *we* had made some mistake; and even if after all we could not reconcile all parts (supposing it), should we not leave them *as* difficulties, and believe in the system notwithstanding? The Apostles refer to a large existing fact, their system; history informs us of a system, as far as we can tell, contemporaneous, and claiming to be theirs;—what other claimant is there?

Whether, then, the system, referred to but not brought out in Scripture, be latent there or not, whether our view be right or

the Roman view, at any rate a system there is ; we see it, we have it external to Scripture. There it stands, however we may determine this further question. Whether we adopt the wording of our sixth article or not, we cannot obliterate the fact that a system does exist substantially in history ; all the proofs you may bring of the obscurities or the unsystematic character of Scripture cannot touch this independent fact ; were Scripture lost to us, that fact would remain. You have your choice to say that Scripture does, or does not agree with it. If you think it actually *disagrees* with Scripture, then you have your choice between concluding that you are mistaken in so thinking, or that this system coming to us, as it does, on the same evidence with Scripture, yet is not divine as well as Scripture. If, however, you consider that it merely teaches things *additional* to Scripture, then you have no excuse for not admitting it in addition to Scripture. And if it teaches things but *indirectly taught* in Scripture, then you must admit it as an interpreter or comment upon Scripture. But, whether you say it is an accordant or a discordant witness, whether the supplement, complement, or interpreter of Scripture, there it stands, that consistent harmonious system of faith and worship, as in the beginning ; and, if history is allowed any weight in the discussion, it is an effectual refutation of Latitudinarianism. It is a fact concurring with the common sense of mankind and with their wants. Men want a dogmatic system ; and behold in the beginning of Christianity, and from the beginning to this day, there it stands. This is so remarkable a coincidence that it will always practically weigh against Latitudinarian views. Nor does it avail to say, that there were additions made to it in the course of years, or that the feeling of a want may have given rise to it ; for what was added after, whatever it was, could not create that to which it was added ; and I say that first of all, before there was a time for the harmonious uniform expansion of a system, for the experience and supply of human wants, for the influence of innovation, and the growth of corruption, and with all fair allowance for differences of opinion as to how much is primitive, or when this or that

particular fact is witnessed, or what interpretation is to be given to particular passages in historical documents,—from the first a system exists. And we have no right to refuse it, merely on the plea that *we* do not see all the parts of it in Scripture, or that we think some parts of it to be inconsistent with Scripture; for even though some parts were not there, this would not disprove its truth; and even though some parts seem contrary to what is there, this appearance might after all be caused simply by our own incompetency to judge of Scripture.

But perhaps it may here be urged, that I have proved too much; that is, it may be asked, "If this system is so natural, and appears *at once* in the writings of the Apostles' disciples, as in the Epistles of St. Ignatius, *how is it* that it is not in the writings of the Apostles themselves? how does it happen that it does appear in the short Epistles of Ignatius, and does not in the Epistles of St. Paul? so that the tendency of the foregoing argument is to disparage the Apostles' teaching, as showing that it is *not* adapted, and Ignatius's *is* adapted to our wants." But the answer to this is simple; for though the Apostles' writings do not on their surface display the system, they certainly do express (as I have said) a *recognition* of its existence and of its principle. If, then, in spite of this there is no Apostolic system of faith and worship, all we shall have proved by our argument is, that the Apostles are inconsistent with themselves; that they recognize the need of a system, and do not provide one. How it is they do *not* draw down a system, while they nevertheless both recognize its principle and witness its existence, has often been discussed, and perhaps I may say something incidentally on the subject hereafter. Here, I do but observe, that on the one side of the question we have the human heart expecting, Scripture sanctioning, history providing,—a coincidence of three witnesses; and on the other side only this, Scripture *not actually* providing in form and fulness what it sanctions.

Lastly, I would observe that much as Christians have differed in these latter or in former ages, as to what *is* the true faith and what the true worship and discipline of CHRIST, yet one and all

have held that Christianity is dogmatic and social, that creeds and forms are not to be dispensed with. There has been an uninterrupted maintenance of this belief from the beginning of Christianity down to this day, with exceptions so partial and ephemeral as not to deserve notice. I conclude, then, either that the notion of forms and creeds, and of unity in them, is so natural to the human mind as to be spontaneously produced and cherished in every age; or that there has been a strong external reason for its having been so cherished, whether in authority or in argumentative proof, or in the force of tradition. In whatever way we take it, it is a striking evidence in favour of dogmatic religion, and against that unreal form, or rather that mere dream of religion, which pretends that modes of thinking and social conduct are all one and all the same in the eye of God, supposing each of us be sincere in our own.

Dismissing, then, Latitudinarianism once for all, as untenable, and taking for granted that there is a system of religion revealed in the Gospel, I come, as I have already stated several times, to one or other of two conclusions: either that it is not all in Scripture, but part in tradition only, with the Romanists,—or with the English Church, that though it is in tradition, yet that it can also be gathered from the communications of Scripture. As to the non-descript system of religion now in fashion, that nothing is to be believed but what is clearly in Scripture, that all its own doctrines are clearly these and none other, and that as to history it is no matter what it says and what it does not say, except so far that it must be used to prove the canonicity of Scripture, this will come before us again and again in the following Lectures. Suffice that it has all the external extravagance of Latitudinarianism without its internal consistency. It is inconsistent because it is morally better: Latitudinarianism is consistent because it is intellectually deeper. Both, however, are mere theories in theology, and ought to be discarded by serious men. We must give up our ideal notions, and resign ourselves to facts. We must take things as we find them, as God has given them. We did not make them, we cannot alter them, though

we are sometimes tempted to think it very hard we cannot. We must submit to them instead of quarrelling with them. We must submit to the indirectness of Scripture, unless we think it wiser and better to become Romanists; and we must employ our minds rather (if so be) in *accounting* for the fact, than in *excepting* against it.

LECTURE III.

ON THE GENERAL STRUCTURE OF THE BIBLE AS A
RECORD OF FAITH.

Enough perhaps has now been said by way of opening the subject before us. The state of the case, I conceive to be as I have said. The structure of Scripture is such, so irregular and immethodical, that either we must hold that the Gospel doctrine or message is not contained in Scripture (and if so, either that there is no message at all given, or that it is given elsewhere, out of Scripture), or, as the alternative, we must hold that it is but indirectly and covertly recorded there, under the surface. Moreover, since the great bulk of professing Christians in this country, whatever their particular denomination may be, do consider, agreeably with the English Church, that there *are* doctrines revealed (though they differ what), and that they are *in Scripture*, they must undergo, and resign themselves to an inconvenience which certainly does attach to our Creed, and, as they often suppose, to it alone, that of having to infer from Scripture, to prove circuitously, to argue at disadvantage, to leave difficulties, and to seem to others weak or fanciful reasoners. They must leave off attacking our proofs of our doctrines as insufficient, not being stronger in their own proofs themselves. No matter whether they are Lutherans or Calvinists, Wesleyans or Independents, they have to wind their way through obstacles, in and out, avoiding some things and catching at others, like men making their way in a wood, or over broken ground. If they believe in consubstantiation with Luther, or the absolute predestination of individuals, with Calvin, they have very few texts to produce which, in argument, will appear even specious. Or how, if Wesleyans, do they prove that the Gospel sanctions an order of ministers, yet allows man to choose them? Where do they find a precedent in Scripture for a self-chosen ministry? or if no mere succession,

and no mere human appointment are intended by them, where has the Gospel promised them infallible evidence from God, whom He will have as His ministers one by one? And still more plainly have these religionists strong texts against them, whatever be their sect or persuasion. If they be Lutherans, they have to encounter St. James's declaration, that "by works a man is justified, and not by faith only¹;" if Calvinists, God's solemn declaration, that "as He liveth, He willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should live;" if a Wesleyan, St. Paul's precept to "obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves²;" if Independents, the same Apostle's declaration concerning the Church's being "the pillar and ground of the Truth;" if Zuinglians, they have to explain how Baptism is not really and in fact connected with regeneration, considering it is always connected with it in Scripture; if Friends, why they allow women to speak in their assemblies, contrary to St. Paul's plain prohibition; if Erastians, why they distort our SAVIOUR's plain declaration, that His kingdom is not of this world; if maintainers of the every day secular Christianity, what they make of the woe denounced against riches, and the praise bestowed on celibacy. Hence, none of these sects and persuasions has any right to ask the question of which they are so fond, "Where in the Bible are the Church doctrines to be found? *Where* in Scripture, for instance, is Apostolical succession, or the priestly office, or the power of absolution?" This is with them a favourite mode of dealing with us; and I in return ask them, *Where* are we told that the Bible contains all that is necessary to salvation? Where are we told that the New Testament is inspired? Where are we told that justification is by faith only? Where are we told that every individual who is elected is saved? Where are we told that we may leave the Church, if we think its ministers do not preach the Gospel? or, Where are we told that we may make ministers for ourselves?

All Protestants, then, in this country, Churchmen, Presbyterians, Baptists, Arminians, Calvinists, Lutherans, Friends, Inde-

¹ James ii. 24.

² Heb. xiii. 7.

pendents, Wesleyans, Unitarians, and whatever other sect claims the Protestant name, all who consider the Bible as the one standard of faith, and much more if they think it the standard of morals and discipline, are more or less in this difficulty,—the more so, the wider they consider the field of revelation, and the less, the narrower ; but they cannot escape from it altogether, except by falling back into utter scepticism and latitudinarianism, or on the other hand going on into Romanism. Nor does it rid them of their difficulties, as I have said more than once, to allege, that all that is incapable of clear Scripture proof are the *peculiarities* of each sect : so that if all Protestants were to agree to put out of sight their respective peculiarities, they would then have a creed set forth distinctly, clearly, and adequately, in Scripture. For take that single instance which I have referred to in a former Lecture, the doctrine of the Trinity. Is this to be considered as a mere peculiarity or no ? Apparently a peculiarity ; for on the one hand it is not held by all Protestants, and next, it is not brought out in form in Scripture. First, the word Trinity is not in Scripture. Next I ask, *How* many of the verses of the Athanasian Creed are distinctly set down in Scripture ? and further, take particular portions of the doctrine, viz. that CHRIST is equal to the FATHER, that the HOLY GHOST is GOD, or that the HOLY GHOST proceedeth from the FATHER and the SON, and consider the kind of texts, and the modes of using them, by which the proof is built up. Yet is there a more sacred, a more vital doctrine in the circle of the articles of faith than this ? Let then no one take refuge and comfort in the idea that he will be what is commonly called an orthodox Protestant,—I mean, that he will be just this and no more ; that he will admit the doctrine of the Trinity, but not that of the Apostolical succession,—of the Atonement, but not of the Lord's Supper,—of the influences of grace, but not of Baptism. This is an impossible position : it is shutting one eye, and looking with the other. Shut both or open both. Deny that there is any necessary doctrine in Scripture, or consent to prove indirectly thence what you at present disbelieve.

The whole argument, however, depends of course on the certainty of the fact assumed, viz. Scripture *is* unsystematic and

irregular in its communications to the extent to which I have supposed it to be. To this point, therefore, I shall, in the Lectures which follow, direct attention. Here, however, I shall confine myself to a brief argument to show that under the circumstances it *must* be so. I observe then as follows :—

In what way inspiration is compatible with that personal agency on the part of its instruments, which the composition of the Bible evidences, we know not ; but if any thing is certain, it is this,—that, though the Bible is inspired, and therefore, in one sense, written by God, yet very large portions of it, if not far the greater part of it, are written in as free and unconstrained a manner, and (apparently) with as little consciousness of a supernatural dictation or restraint, on the part of His earthly instruments, as if He had had no share in the work. As God rules the will, yet the will is free,—as He rules the course of the world, yet men conduct it,—so He has inspired the Bible, yet men have written it. Whatever else is true about it, this is true,—that we may speak of the history, or mode of its composition, as truly as of that of other books ; we may speak of its writers having an object in view, being influenced by circumstances, being anxious, taking pains, purposely omitting or introducing things, supplying what others had left, or leaving things incomplete. Though the Bible be inspired, it has all such characteristics as might attach to a book uninspired,—the characteristics of dialect and style, the distinct effects of times and places, youth and age, of moral and intellectual character ; and I insist on this, lest in what I am going to say, I seem to forget (what I do not forget), that in spite of its human form, it has in it the spirit and the mind of God.

I observe, then, that Scripture is not one book ; it is a great number of writings, of various persons, living at different times, put together into one, and assuming its existing form as if casually and by accident. It is as if you were to seize the papers or correspondence of leading men in any school of philosophy or science, which were never designed for publication, and bring them out in one volume. You would find probably in the collection so resulting many papers begun and not finished ; some

parts systematic and didactic, but the greater part made up of hints or of notices, which assumed first principles instead of asserting them, or of discussions upon particular points which happened to call for their attention. I say the doctrines, the first principles, the rules, the objects of the school, would be taken for granted, alluded to, implied, not stated. You would have some trouble to get at them ; you would have many repetitions, many hiatuses, many things which looked like contradictions ; you would have to work your way through heterogeneous materials, and after your best efforts there would be much hopelessly obscure ; or, on the other hand, you might look in vain in such a casual collection for some particular opinions which the writers were known nevertheless to have held, nay to have insisted on.

Such, I conceive, with limitations presently to be noticed, is the structure of the Bible. Parts, indeed, are more regular than others : parts of the Pentateuch form a regular history. The book of Job is a regular narrative ; some prophecies are regular, one or two epistles ; but even these portions are for the most part incorporated in or with writings which are not regular ; and we never can be sure what we shall find, or what we shall not find. They are the writings of men who had already been introduced into a knowledge of the unseen world and the society of Angels, and reported what they had seen and heard ; and they are full of allusions to a system, a course of things, which was ever before their minds, which was too awful and too familiar to be described minutely, which we do not know, and which these allusions, such as they are, but partially disclose to us. Try to make out the history of Rome from the extant letters of some of its great politicians, and from the fragments of ancient annals, histories, laws, inscriptions, and medals, and you will have something like the matter of fact, viewed antecedently, as regards the structure of the Bible, and the task of deducing the true system of religion from it.

This being, as I conceive, really the state of the case in substance, I own it seems to me, *judging antecedently*, very improbable indeed, that it *should* contain the whole of the revealed

word of God. I own that to my mind, at first sight, I am naturally led to look not only there, but *elsewhere* for notices of sacred truth ; and I consider that they who say that the Bible *does* contain the whole revelation, (as I do say myself,) that they and I, that we, have what is called the *onus probandi*, the burden and duty of proving it, on our side. Till we prove it does contain the whole of revealed truth, it is natural, from the *prima facie* appearance of Scripture, to suppose it does not. Why, for instance, should a certain number of letters, more or less private, written by St. Paul and others to particular persons or bodies, contain the whole of what the Spirit taught them ? We do not look into Scripture for a complete history of the secular matters which it mentions ; why should we look for a complete account of *religious* truth ? You will say that its writers wrote in order to communicate religious truth ; true, but not *all* religious truth : that is the point. They did not sit down with a design to commit to paper all they had to say on the whole subject, all they could say about the Gospel ; but they either wrote to correct some particular error of a particular time or place, or to “ stir up the pure minds ” of their brethren, or in answer to questions, or to give directions for conduct, or on indifferent matters. For instance, St. Luke says he wrote his Gospel that Christians might know “ the certainty of the things in which they had been instructed.” Does this imply he told all that was to be told ? Any how he did *not* ; for the other Evangelists add to his narrative. It is then far from being a self-evident truth that Scripture must contain all the revealed counsel of God ; rather the probability lies the other way at first sight.

Nevertheless, at least as regards matters of faith, it does (as we in common with all Protestants hold) contain all that is necessary for salvation ; it has been *overruled* to do so by Him who inspired it. By parallel acts of power, He both secretly inspired the books, and secretly formed them into a perfect rule or canon. I shall not prove what we all admit, but I state it to prevent misapprehension. If asked *how* we know this to be the case, I answer, that the early Church thought so, which must have known. And, if this answer does not please, the inquirer

may look out for a better as he can. I know of no other. I require no other. For our present Church it is enough, as the Homilies show. It is enough that Scripture has been overruled to contain the whole Christian faith, and that the early Church so taught, though its form at first sight might lead to an opposite conclusion. And this being once proved, we see in this state of things an analogy to God's providence in other cases. How confused is the course of the world, yet it is the working out of a moral system, and is overruled in every point by God's will! Or take the structure of the earth; mankind is placed in fertile and good dwelling-places, with hills and valleys, springs and fruitful fields, with metals and marbles, and other minerals, and coal, and seas, and forests; yet this beautiful and fully furnished surface is the result of (humanly speaking) a series of accidents, of gradual influences and sudden convulsions, of a long history of change and chance.

Yet while we admit, or rather maintain, that the Bible is the one standard of faith, there is no reason why we should suppose the overruling hand of God to go further than we are told it has gone. That it has overruled so far as to make the apparently casual writings of the Apostles a canon of faith, is no reason that it should have given them a systematic structure, or a didactic form, or a completeness in their subject-matter. So far as we have no proof that the Bible is more than at first sight it seems to be, so far the antecedent probability lies against its being more. Both the history of its composition and its internal structure are against its being a complete depository of the Divine Will, unless the early Church says it is. Now the early Church does not tell us this. It does not seem to have considered that a complete code of *morals*, or of Church *government*, or of *rites*, or of *discipline*, is in Scripture; and therefore so far the original improbability remains in force. Again, this antecedent improbability tells even in the case of the *doctrines* of faith as far as this, that it reconciles us to the necessity of gaining them *indirectly* from Scripture, for it is a near thing (if I may so speak) that they are in Scripture at all; the wonder is that they are *all* there; humanly judging, they would not be there but for

God's interposition ; and therefore, since they are there by a sort of accident, it is not strange they shall be but latent there, and only indirectly produceable thence. God effects His greatest ends by apparent accidents. As in respect to this earth, we do not find minerals or plants arranged within it as in a cabinet,—as we do not find the materials for building laid out in order, stone, timber, and iron,—as metal is found in ore, and timber on the tree,—so we must not be surprised, but think it great gain, though we find revealed doctrines scattered about high and low in Scripture, in places expected and unexpected. It could not be otherwise, the same circumstances being supposed. Supposing fire, water, and certain chemical and electrical agents in free operation, the earth's precious contents *could* not be found arranged in order and in the light of day without a miracle ; and so without a miracle (which we are no where told to expect) we could not possibly find in Scripture all sacred truths in their place, each taught clearly and fully, with its suitable prominence, its varied bearings, its developed meaning, supposing Scripture to be, what it is, the work of various independent minds in various times and places, and under various circumstances. And so much on what might reasonably be expected from the state of the case.

LECTURE IV.

MODE IN WHICH FACTS OF HISTORY ARE CONTAINED
IN SCRIPTURE.

I HAVE above insisted much upon this point,—that if Scripture contains any religious system at all, it *must* contain it covertly, and teach it obscurely, because it is altogether most immethodical and irregular in its structure; and therefore that the indirectness of the Scripture proof of the Catholic system is not an objection to its cogency, except as it is an objection to the Scripture proof of every other system; and accordingly that we must take our choice (Romanism being for the time put aside,) between utter latitudinarianism and what may be called the method of Indirect Consequences. Now this argument depends evidently on the fact, that Scripture is thus unsystematic in its structure,—a fact which it would not be necessary to dwell upon, so obvious is it, except that examining into it will be found much to increase its appositeness as an argument, and to throw light upon the whole subject of Scripture teaching. Something, accordingly, I have already observed on the subject, from antecedent considerations, and now I proceed, in the course of several Lectures, to inquire into the matter of fact.

I shall refer to Scripture both as a record of historical events and of general doctrine, with a view of exhibiting the peculiar character of its structure, the unostentatious, indirect, or covert manner, which for whatever reason it adopts in its statements of whatever kind. This, I say, will throw light on the subject in hand; for so it is, directly we come to see that any thing, which has already attracted our notice in one way, holds good in others, that there is a certain law according to which it occurs uniformly in various circumstances, we gain a satisfaction from the very coincidence, and seem to find a reason for it in the very circumstance that it does proceed on a rule or law. Even in matters of conduct, in

which an external and invariable standard might seem to interfere, the avowal, "It is my way," "I always do so," is often given and accepted, as a satisfactory account of another's mode of acting. Order implies a principle; order in God's written word implies a principle or design in it. If I show that the Bible is written throughout with this absence of method, I seem to find an order in the very disorder, and become reconciled to it in particular instances. That it is obscure and inartificial as regards the relation of facts, seems to explain its being so in statement of doctrines; that it is so as regards one set of doctrines, seems to account for its being so as regards another. Thus, the argument from analogy, which starts with the profession of being only *negative*, ends with being *positive*, when drawn out into details; such being the difference between its abstract pretension and its actual and practical force.

In the present Lecture I propose to mention some instances of the unstudied and therefore perplexed character of Scripture, as regards its relation of *facts*; and to apply them, as I go, to the objection to the Church doctrines which is under discussion, drawn from the mode in which they too are stated in Scripture; and I shall begin without further preface.

An illustration occurs in the very beginning of the Bible. However we account for it, with which I am not concerned, you will find that the narrative of the Creation, commenced in the first chapter, ends at the third verse of the second chapter, and then begins a fresh narrative, carrying on the former, but going back a little way. The difference is marked, as is well known, by the use of the word "God" in the former narrative, and of "LORD God" in the latter. According to the former, GOD is said to create man "in His own image; *male and female* created He them" on the sixth day. According to the latter, the LORD GOD created Adam, and placed him in the garden of Eden to dress and keep it, and gave him the command about the forbidden fruit, and brought the beasts to him; and *afterwards*, on his finding the want of a helpmeet, caused him to sleep, and took one of his ribs, and thence made woman. This is an instance of the unsolicitous freedom and want of system of the sa-

cred narrative. The second account, which is an expansion of the first, is in the letter opposed to it. Now supposing the narrative contained in the second chapter was *not* in Scripture, but *was* the received Church account of man's creation, it is plain not only would it not be *in*, but it could not even be gathered or proved *from* the first chapter ; which makes the argument all the stronger. Evidently not a pretence could be made of *proving* from the first chapter the account of the dressing the garden, the naming the brutes, the sleep, and the creation of Eve from a rib. And most persons in this day would certainly have disbelieved it. Why? Because it wanted *authority*? No. There would be some sense in such a line of argument, but they would not go into the question of authority. Whether or not it had Catholic tradition in its favour, whether Catholic tradition were or were not a sufficient guarantee of its truth, would not even enter into their minds, they would not go so far, they would disbelieve it at once on two grounds ; first, they would say Scripture was *silent* about it, nay, that it contradicted it, that it spoke of man and woman being created both together on the sixth day ; and, secondly, they would say it was incongruous and highly improbable, and that the account of Adam's rib sounded like an idle tradition. If (I say) they set it aside for want of evidence of its truth, that is a fair ground ; but I repeat, their reason for setting it aside (can it be doubted?) would be, that it was *inconsistent* with Scripture in actual statement, and *unlike* it in tone. But it *is* in Scripture. It seems then that a statement may seem at variance with a certain passage of Scripture, may bear an improbable exterior, and yet come from God. Is it so strange, so contrary to the Scripture account of the institution, that the Lord's Supper should be a sacrifice, as it is inconsistent with the first of Genesis, and antecedently improbable that the second chapter also should be true? No one ever professed to deduce the second chapter from the first : all Anglo-Catholics profess to prove the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper from Scripture. Thus the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist is not unscriptural, unless the Book of Genesis is (what is impossible, God forbid!) self-contradictory.

Again, take the following account, in the beginning of the fifth

chapter of Genesis, and say whether, if this only had come down to us, we should not, with our present notions, have utterly disallowed the account of Eve's creation, the temptation, the fall, and the history of Cain and Abel :—" This is the book of the generation of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God created He him ; male and female created He them ; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created. *And* Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image, and called his name Seth." If the contrast between God's image and Adam's image be insisted on, then I would point out, how indirect and concealed it is.

Again : I believe I am right in saying that we are nowhere told in Scripture, certainly not in the Old Testament, that the Serpent that tempted Eve was the Devil. The nearest approach to any intimation of it is in the last book of the Bible, where the devil is called " that old serpent." Can we be surprised that other truths are but obscurely conveyed in Scripture, when this hardly escapes (as I may say) omission ?

Again : we have two accounts of Abraham denying his wife ; also, one instance of Isaac being betrayed into the same weakness. Now supposing we had only one or two of these in Scripture, and the remaining by tradition, should we not have utterly rejected the latter as a perverted account ? On the one hand, we should have said it was inconceivable that *two* such passages should occur in Abraham's life, or on the other that it was most unlikely that both Abraham and Isaac should have gone to Gerar, in the time of a king of the same name, Abimelech. Yet because St. James says, " Confess your faults *one to another*," if we read that in the early Church there was an usage of secret confession made *to the priest*, we are apt to consider this latter practice, which our Communion Service recognizes, as a mere perversion or corruption of the Scripture command, and that the words of St. James are a positive argument against it.

In Deuteronomy we read that Moses fasted for forty days in the Mount, *twice* ; in Exodus only one fast is mentioned. Now supposing Deuteronomy were not Scripture, but merely part of the Prayer Book, should we not say it was in this instance evi-

dently mistaken ? This is what men do as regards Episcopacy. Deacons are spoken of by St. Paul in his Epistles to Timothy and Titus, and Bishops ; but no third order in direct and express terms. The Church considers that there are two kinds of Bishops, or, as the word signifies, overseers ; those who have the oversight of single parishes, or priests, and those who have the oversight of many together, or what are now specially called Bishops. People say, " Here is a contradiction with Scripture, which speaks of two orders, not of three." Yes, just as really a contradiction as the chapter in Deuteronomy is of the chapter in Exodus. But this again is to take far lower ground than we need ; for we all contend that Episcopacy, even granting it is an addition to some passages of Scripture, yet is in accordance with others.

Again : in the history of Balaam we read, " God came unto Balaam at night, and said unto him, If the men come to call thee, rise up and *go with them* ; but yet the word which I shall say unto thee, that shalt thou speak ¹." Presently we read, " And God's anger was kindled, *because* he went : and the Angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary against him." Now supposing the former circumstance (the permission given him to go) was not in Scripture, but was only the received belief of the Church, would it not be at once rejected by most men as inconsistent with Scripture ? And supposing a Churchman were to entreat objectors to consider the strong evidence in Catholic tradition for its truth, would not the answer be, " Do not tell us of evidence ; we cannot give you a hearing ; your statement is in plain contradiction to the inspired text, which says that God's anger was kindled. How then can He have told Balaam to go with the men ? The matter stands to reason ; we leave it to the private judgment of any unbiassed person. Sophistry indeed may try to reconcile the tradition with Scripture ; but after all you are unscriptural, and we uphold the pure word of truth without glosses and refinements." Now, is not this just what is done in matters of doctrine ? Thus because our Lord repre-

¹ Numb. xxii. 20.

sents the Father saying, in the parable of the Prodigal Son, "Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet¹," it is argued that this is inconsistent with the Church usage, even supposing for argument's sake it has no Scripture sanction, of penance for sin.

Again: the Book of Deuteronomy, being a recapitulation of the foregoing Books, in an address to the Israelites, is in the position of the Apostolic Epistles. Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers being a more orderly and systematic account, are somewhat in the position of Catholic tradition. Now Deuteronomy differs in some minute points from the former Books. For example: in Exodus, the fourth commandment contains a reference to the creation of the world on the seventh day, as the reason of the institution of the Sabbath: in Deuteronomy, the same commandment refers it to the deliverance of the Israelites out of Egypt on that day. Supposing we had only the latter statement in Scripture, and supposing the former to be only the received doctrine of the Church, would not this former, that is, the statement contained in Exodus, that the Sabbatical rest was in memory of God resting after the Creation, have seemed at once fanciful and unfounded? Would it not have been said, "Why do you have recourse to the mysticism of types? here is a plain intelligible reason for keeping the Sabbath holy, viz. the deliverance from Egypt. Be content with this:—besides, your view is grossly carnal and anthropomorphic. How can ALMIGHTY GOD be said to rest? And it is unscriptural; for CHRIST says, "My FATHER worketh hitherto, and I work." Now is it not a similar procedure to argue, that *since* the Holy Eucharist is a "communication of the body and blood of CHRIST," *therefore* it is not *also* a mysterious representation of His meritorious sacrifice in the sight of ALMIGHTY GOD?

Again: the Books of Samuel and Kings, compared with those of Chronicles, would supply many instances in point, of which I select a few. For instance:—

In 2 Kings xv. we read of the reign of Azariah king of Judah.

¹ Luke xv. 22.

It is said "he did that which was right in the sight of the LORD according to all that his father Amaziah had done;" and then that "the LORD smote the king, so that he was a leper unto the day of his death;" and we are referred for "the rest of the acts of Azariah, and all that he did," to "the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah." We turn to the Chronicles and find an account of the cause of the visitation which came upon him. "When he was strong, his heart was lifted up to his destruction; for he transgressed against the LORD his God, and went into the temple of the LORD to burn incense upon the altar of incense. And Azariah the priest went in after him, and with him fourscore priests of the LORD that were valiant men. And they withstood Uzziah the king, and said unto him, It appertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the LORD, but to the priests the sons of Aaron, that are consecrated to burn incense: go out of the sanctuary, for thou hast trespassed; neither shall it be for thine honour from the LORD God. Then Uzziah was wroth, and had a censer in his hand to burn incense; and while he was wroth with the priests, the leprosy even rose up in his forehead before the priests in the house of the LORD, from beside the incense altar. And Azariah, the chief priest, and all the priests, looked upon him, and, behold, he was leprous in his forehead, and they thrust him out from thence; yea, himself hasted also to go out, because the LORD had smitten him. And Uzziah the king was a leper unto the day of his death, and dwelt in a several house, being a leper¹."

Now nothing can be more natural than this joint narrative. The one is brief, but refers to the other for the details; and the other gives it. Suppose, then, a captious mind were to dwell upon the remarkable *silence* of the former,—magnify it as an objection,—and on the other hand should allude to the tendency of the second narrative to uphold the priesthood, and should attribute it to such a design. Should we think such an argument valid, or merely ingenious, clever, amusing, yet not trustworthy? I suppose the latter; yet this instance is very near a

¹ 2 Chron. xxvi. 16—21.

parallel to the case as it stands, between the New Testament and the doctrine of the Church. For instance, after St. Paul has declared some plain truths to the Corinthians, he says, "Be ye followers of me; *for this cause*, have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, *who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways*, which be in CHRIST, as I *teach* every where in every Church¹." He refers them to an authority beyond and besides his epistle,—to Timothy, nay to his doctrine as he had taught in every Church. If then we can ascertain, for that I here assume, what was that doctrine taught every where in the Church, we have ascertained that to which St. Paul refers us; and if that doctrine so ascertained adds many things in detail to what he has written, developes one thing, and gives a different impression of others, it is no more than such a reference might lead us to expect, it is the very thing he prepares us for. It as little therefore contradicts what is written, as the books of Chronicles contradict the book of Kings; and if it appears to favour the priesthood more than St. Paul does, this is no more than can be objected to the Chronicles compared with the Kings.

Again after, not *teaching*, but *reminding* them about the Lord's Supper, he adds, "*the rest* will I set in order when I come." When then we find the Church has always considered that Holy Sacrament to be not only a feast or supper, but in its fulness to contain a sacrifice, and to require a certain Liturgical form, how does this contradict the inspired text, which plainly signifies that something else is to come besides what it has said itself? So far from its being strange that the Church brings out and fills up St. Paul's outline, it would be very strange if it did not. Yet it is not unusual to ascribe these additional details to priestcraft, and without proof to call them corruptions and innovations, in the very spirit in which freethinkers have before now attributed the books of Chronicles to the Jewish priests, and accused them of bigotry and intolerance.

It is remarkable how frequent are the allusions in the Epistles

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 17.

to *other* Apostolic teaching beyond themselves, i. e. besides the written authority. For instance ; in the same chapter, "I *praise* you, brethren, that ye *remember* me in all things, and *keep the traditions*, as I delivered them to you." Again, "I have also received," or had by tradition, "of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you," that is, gave by tradition unto you. This giving and receiving was not by writing. Again, "If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God:" he appeals to the received custom of the Church. Again, "I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand, for I delivered unto you (gave by tradition) first of all that which I also received," by tradition. Again, "Stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle¹." Such passages prove, as all will grant, that, at the time there *were* means of knowledge *distinct* from Scripture, and containing information in addition to it. When, then, we actually do find in the existing Church system of those times, as historically recorded, such additional information, that information may be Apostolic or it may be not ; but however this is, the mere circumstance that it *is* in addition, is no proof against its being Apostolic ; that it is extra-scriptural is no proof that it is unscriptural, for St. Paul himself tells us in Scripture that there are truths not in Scripture. And we may as fairly object to the books of Chronicles that they are an addition to the books of Kings. In saying this, I am not entering into the question which lies between us and the Romanists, whether these further truths are substantive additions or developements, whether in faith or in conduct and discipline.

Further : the Chronicles pass over David's great sin, and Solomon's fall ; and they insert Manasseh's repentance. The account of Manasseh's reign is given at length in the second book of Kings ; it is too long of course to cite, but the following are some of its particulars. Manasseh² "used enchantments and dealt with familiar spirits and wizards;" he "seduced them to do more evil than did the nations whom the Lord destroyed before the

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 2. 16. 23 ; xv. 1—3. 2 Thess. ii. 15.

² 2 Kings xxi.

children of Israel." "Moreover Manasseh shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another." Afterwards, when Josiah had made his reforms, the sacred writer adds ¹, "Notwithstanding the LORD turned not from the *fierceness of His great wrath*, wherewith His anger was kindled against Judah, *because* of all the provocations that *Manasseh* had provoked him withal." And again in Jehoiakim's time ², "Surely, at the commandment of the LORD came this upon Judah, to remove them out of His sight for the sins of Manasseh, according to all that he did ; and also for the innocent blood that he shed ; for he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood, *which the Lord would not pardon.*" And again in the book of Jeremiah ³, "I will cause them to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth, *because of Manasseh* the son of Hezekiah king of Judah, for that which he did in Jerusalem." Who would conjecture with such passages of Scripture before him, that Manasseh repented before his death, and was forgiven ; but to complete the *illusion*, (as it may be called,) the account of his reign in the book of Kings ends thus ⁴:—"Now the rest of the acts of Manasseh, and all that he did, and *his sin that he sinned*, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah ?" not a word about his repentance. Might it not then be plausibly argued that the books of Kings precisely limited and defined *what* the Chronicles were to relate, "*the sin that he sinned ;*" that this was to be the theme of the history, its outline and ground plan, and that their absolute silence about his repentance was a cogent, positive argument that he did not repent ? How little do they prepare one for the following most affecting record of him ? "When he was in affliction, he besought the LORD his God, and humbled himself greatly before the God of his fathers, and prayed unto Him. And He was intreated of him, and heard his supplication, and brought him again to Jerusalem into his kingdom. Then Manasseh knew that the LORD He was God. And he took away the strange gods, and the idol out of the house of the LORD, and the altars that he had built in the mount of the house of the LORD, and in Jerusalem, and cast them

¹ 2 Kings xxiii. 26.² 2 Kings xxiv. 3, 4.³ Jer. xv. 4.⁴ 2 Kings xxi.

out of the city, &c. Now the rest of the acts of Manasseh, and his prayer unto his God, and the words of the seers that spake to him in the name of the LORD God of Israel, behold they are written in the book of the kings of Israel. So Manasseh slept with his fathers¹." If then the books of Kings were the only canonical account, and the books of Chronicles part of the Apocrypha, would not the latter be pronounced an unscriptural record, a legend and a tradition of men, not because the evidence for their truth was not sufficient, but as if they contradicted the books of Kings? at least, is not this what is done as regards the Church system of doctrine, as if it must be at variance with the New Testament, because it views the Gospel from a somewhat distinct point of view, and in a distinct light?

Again: the account given of Jehoash in the Kings is as follows²:—"Jehoash did that which was right in the sight of the LORD *all his days, wherein* Jehoiada the priest instructed him." And it ends thus, "His servants arose and made a conspiracy, and slew Joash in the house of Millo:" there is no hint of any great defection or miserable ingratitude on his part, though, as it turns out on referring to Chronicles, the words "*all his days wherein,*" &c. are significant. In the Chronicles we learn that *after* good Jehoiada's death, whose wife had saved him from Athaliah, and who preserved for him his throne, he went and served groves and idols, and killed Zechariah the son of Jehoiada when he was raised up by the Spirit of God to protest. Judgments followed,—the Syrians, and then "*great diseases,*" and then assassination. Now if the apparently simple words, "*all the days wherein,*" &c. are emphatic, why may not our Saviour's words, "If thou bring thy gift to the *altar,*" be emphatic, or "If thou wouldst be *perfect,*" suggest a doctrine which it does not exhibit?

Now let us proceed to the Gospels; a few instances must suffice.

Considering how great a miracle the raising of Lazarus is in itself, and how connected with our LORD's death, how is it that the three first Gospels do not mention it? They speak of the

¹ 2 Chron. xxxiii. 12—20.

² 2 Kings xii.

chief priests taking counsel to put him to death, but give no reason ; rather they seem to assign other reasons, as the parables he spoke against them¹. At length St. John mentions the miracle and its consequences. Things important then may be true, though particular inspired documents do not mention them. As the raising of Lazarus is true, though not contained at all in the three first Gospels, so the gift of consecrating the Eucharist may have been committed by CHRIST to the priesthood, though only indirectly taught in any of the four. Will you say, I am arguing against our own Church, which says, that Scripture “contains all things necessary to be believed to salvation?” Doubtless, Scripture *contains* all things necessary to be *believed* ; but there may be things *contained* which are not *on the surface*, and things which belong to the *ritual* and not to *belief*. Points of faith may lie *under* the surface, points of observance need not be in Scripture *at all*. The consecrating power is a point of ritual, yet it *is* indirectly taught in Scripture, though not brought out, when CHRIST said, “Do this ;” for He spake to the Apostles *who* were priests, not to His disciples generally.

Again : I just now mentioned ‘the apparent repetition in Genesis of the account of Abraham’s denying his wife ; a remark which applies to the parallel miracles which occur in the histories of Elijah and Elisha, as the raising of the dead child and the multiplication of the oil. Were only one of the parallel instances in Scripture, we should certainly call the other a corruption or distorted account ; and not without some show of reason, till other and better reasons were brought. And in like manner as regards the Gospels, did the account of the feeding of the 4000 with seven loaves rest on the testimony of Antiquity, most of us would have said, “You see how little you can trust the fathers ; it was not 4000 with seven loaves, but 5000 with five.” Again, should we not have pronounced that the discourses in Luke vi. xi. and xii., if they came to us through the fathers, were the same only in a corrupt form as the Sermon on the Mount in Matt. v—vii. and as xxiii. ? Nay, we should have seized for instance on Luke xi. 41, “But rather give alms of such things

¹ Matt. xxi. 45.

as ye have, and behold *all things are clean* unto you," as a symptom of incipient Popery, a mystery already working. Yes, our Saviour's own sacred words (I fear too truly) would have been seized on by some of us as the signs of the dawn of Antichrist. This is a most miserable thought.

Again : St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, say, that Simon of Cyrene bore CHRIST's cross ; St. John, that CHRIST Himself bore it. Both might be true, and both of course were true. He bore it part of the way, and Simon part. Yet I conceive, did we find it was the tradition of the Church that Simon bore it, we should decide, without going into the evidence, that this was a gloss upon the pure scriptural statement. So in like manner, even supposing that, when St. Paul says, "Ye do *show forth* the Lord's death till He come," he meant, which I do not grant, by "show forth," preach, remind each other of, or commemorate among yourselves, and nothing more, (which I repeat I do not grant,) even then it may be that the Holy Eucharist is also a remembrance in God's sight, a pleading *before Him* the merits of CHRIST's death, and so far a propitiatory offering, though this view of it were only contained in the immemorial usage of the Church, and was no point of necessary faith contained in Scripture.

Again : Judas is represented as hanging himself in St. Matthew, yet in the Acts as falling headlong, and his bowels gushing out. I do not mean to say, of course, that these accounts are irreconcilable even by us ; but is the difference wider than this, which exists between the explicit Scripture statement that confirmation imparted miraculous gifts, and the Church view, not clearly brought out in Scripture, that it is also an ordinary rite conferring ordinary ?

We know how difficult it is to reconcile the distinct accounts of the occurrences which took place at the Resurrection with each other, and of our Lord's appearances to His disciples. For instance : according to Matt. xxviii. it might seem that CHRIST did not appear to His disciples till He met them in the mountain in Galilee ; but in St. Luke and St. John His first appearance was on the evening of the day of Resurrection. Again : in the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Luke, the Ascension

seems to follow immediately on the Resurrection; but in the Acts our LORD is declared to have shown Himself to His disciples for forty days. These forty days are a blank in two Gospels. And in like manner, even though Scripture be considered to be altogether *silent* as to the intermediate state, and to pass from the mention of death to that of the judgment, there is nothing in this circumstance to disprove the Church's doctrine, (if there be *other* grounds for it), that there is an intermediate state, and that it is important, that in it the souls of the faithful are purified and grow in grace, that they pray for us, and that our prayers benefit them.

Moreover, there is on the face of the New Testament plain evidence, that often it is but *referring* to the circumstances it relates, *as known*, and not narrating them. Thus St. Luke, after describing our LORD's consecration of the bread at supper time, adds immediately, "*Likewise* also the cup after supper, saying¹," &c. he does not narrate it in its place; he does but allude to it as a thing well known in the way of a note or memorandum. Again: St. Mark, in giving an account of St. John's Baptist's martyrdom, says, "When his disciples heard of it, they came and took up his corpse and laid it in *the* tomb²." He is evidently speaking of an occurrence, and of a tomb which were well known to those for whom he wrote. If historical facts be thus merely alluded to, not taught, why may not doctrines also? Here again it will be replied, that Scripture was written to teach doctrine, not history; but in the case before us this will not hold good for many reasons. First, is it true that the Gospels were *not* written to teach us the *facts* of CHRIST's life? Next, is it true that the account of the institution of the LORD's Supper is a *mere abstract* historical narrative, and not recorded to direct our practice? Further, where is the proof that Scripture was intended to *teach* doctrine? This is one of the main points in dispute. But enough in answer to a gratuitous proposition; and enough indeed in exemplification of the characteristic of Scripture, which I proposed to consider.

¹ Luke xxii. 20.

² Mark vi. 29.

LECTURE V.

THE IMPRESSION CONVEYED BY THE STATEMENT OF FACTS
AND DOCTRINES IN SCRIPTURE.

THE peculiarities, then, of the narrative portion of Scripture are such as I have described; it is unsystematic and unstudied;—from which I would infer, that as Scripture relates *facts* without aiming at completeness or consistency, so it relates *doctrines* also; so that if it does after all include the whole system of doctrine (as we of the English Church hold), it is not from any purpose in the *writers* so to do, but from the overruling providence of God, overruling just so far as this, to secure a certain *result*, not a certain *mode* of attaining it,—not so as to interfere with their free and natural manner of writing, but imperceptibly guiding it; in other words, not securing their teaching against indirectness and irregularity, but against eventual incompleteness. From which it follows, that we must not be surprised to find in Scripture doctrines of the Gospel, however momentous, nevertheless taught obliquely, and capable only of circuitous proof;—such for instance as that of the Blessed Trinity,—and, in the number the especial Church doctrines, such as the Apostolical Succession, the efficacy of the Holy Eucharist, and the details of the Ritual.

The argument, stated in a few words, stands thus:—As distinct portions in Scripture itself are apparently inconsistent with one another, yet are not really so, in like manner it does not follow that Scripture and Catholic doctrine are at variance with each other, even if they too seem to be so.

Now I propose to go over the ground again in somewhat a different way, not confining myself to illustrations from Scripture narrative, but taking others from Scripture teaching also, and

that with a view of answering another form which the objection is likely to take.

The objection then may be put thus :—" We are told, it seems, in the Prayer Book, of a certain large and influential portion of doctrine, as constituting one great part of the Christian revelation, that is, of Sacraments, of Ministers, of Rites, of Observances; we are told that these are the appointed *means* through which CHRIST's gifts are conveyed to us. Now when we turn to Scripture, we see much indeed of those *gifts*, we read much of what He has done for us, by atoning for our sins, and much of what He does in us, that is, much about holiness, faith, peace, love, joy, hope, and obedience; but of those intermediate portions of the revelation coming between Him and us, of which the Church speaks, we read very little. Passages, indeed, are pointed out to us as if containing notices of them, but they are in our judgment singularly deficient and unsatisfactory; and that either because the meaning assigned to them is not obvious and natural, but (as we think) strained, unexpected, recondite, and at best but possible, or because they are conceived in such plain, unpretending words, that we cannot imagine the writers meant to say any great thing in introducing them. On the other hand, a silence is observed in *particular* places, where one might expect the doctrines in question to be mentioned. Moreover, the *general* tone of the New Testament is to our apprehension a full disproof of them; that is, it is moral, rational, elevated, impassioned, but there is nothing of what may be called a sacramental, ecclesiastical, mysterious tone in it.—For instance, let Acts xx. be considered :—" Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread"—who would imagine, from such a mode of speaking, that this was a solemn, mysterious rite? The words 'break bread' are quite a familiar expression. Or again :—" Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."—Here, if the Church system were true, one might have expected that in mentioning 'keeping the feast,' a reference would be made to the Lord's Supper, as being the great feast of

CHRIST's sacrifice ; whereas, instead of the notion of any literal feast occurring to the sacred writer, a mental feast is the only one he proceeds to mention ; and the unleavened bread of the Passover, instead of suggesting to his mind the sacred elements in the Eucharist, is to him but typical of something moral, ' sincerity and truth.' "

" Or again :—' Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world ' .—This means, we are told, that CHRIST is with the present Church, as it is called ; *for* when CHRIST said ' with you,' He meant, with you and your descendants, and the Church so-called at present is descended from the Apostles and first disciples. How very covert, indirect, and unlikely a meaning ! "

" Or, to take another instance : How is it proved that the Lord's Supper is generally necessary to salvation ? By no part of Scripture except the sixth chapter of St. John. Now supposing that a person denies that this passage belongs to the Sacrament, how shall we prove it ? And is it a very strong measure to deny it ? Do not many most excellent men now alive deny it ? have not many now dead denied it ? "

This is the objection now to be considered, which lies, it would seem, in this ; that, *after* considering what was said in the last Lecture, *after* all allowances on the score of the unstudied character of Scripture, there is still a serious difficulty remaining,—that the circumstance that the books of Scripture were written at different times and places, by different persons without concert, explains much,—explains why there is no system in it, why so much is out of place, why great truths come in by the bye, nay, would explain why others were left out, were there any such ; but it does not explain the case as it stands, it does not explain why a doctrine is not introduced when there is a call for it, why a sacred writer should come close up to it, as it were, and yet pass by it ; why, when he does introduce it, he should mention it so obscurely, as not at all to suggest it to an ordinary reader ; why, in short, the tone and character of his writing should be just contrary to his real meaning. This is the difficulty,—strongly,

¹ Matt. xxviii. 20.

may, almost extravagantly put, but still plausible,—on which I shall now set before you some remarks.

Now there are two attributes of the Bible throughout, which, taken together, seem to meet this difficulty,—attributes which, while at first sight in contrast, have a sort of necessary connexion, and set off each other,—simplicity and depth. Simplicity leads a writer to say things *without display*; and depth obliges him to use *inadequate words*. Scripture then treating of invisible things, at best must use words less than they; and, as if from a feeling that *no* words can be worthy of them, it does not condescend to use even the strongest that exist, but often takes the plainest. The deeper the thought, the plainer the word; the word and thought diverge from each other. Again, it is a property of depth to lead a writer into verbal contradictions; and it is a property of simplicity not to care to avoid them. Again, when a writer is deep, his half sentences, parentheses, clauses, nay his words, have a meaning in them independent of the context, and admit of exposition. There is nothing put in for ornament's sake, or for rhetoric; nothing put in for the mere sake of any thing else, but all for its own sake; all as the expressions and shadows of great things, as seeds of thought, and with corresponding realities. Moreover, when a writer is deep, or again, when he is simple, he does not set about exhausting his subject in his remarks upon it; he says so much as is in point, no more; he does not go out of his way to complete a view or to catch at collateral thoughts: he has something before him which he aims at, and while he cannot help including much in his meaning which he does not aim at, he *does* aim at one thing, not at another. Now to illustrate these remarks upon Scripture, and to apply them.

1. One of the most remarkable characteristics of Scripture narrative, which I suppose all readers must have noticed, is the absence of expressions by which the reader can judge whether the events recorded are presented for praise or blame. A plain bare series of facts is drawn out; and whether for imitation or warning often cannot be decided except by the context, or by the event, or by our general notions of propriety,—often not at

all. The bearing and drift of the narrative are not given.—For instance, when the prophet Isaiah told Ahaz to ask a sign; he said, “I will not ask, neither *will I tempt* the Lord.” Was this right or wrong?

When Elisha said to Joash, “Smite on the ground,” the king “smote thrice and stayed.” What was the fault of this? We should not know it was faulty but by the event, viz. that “the man of God was wroth with him, and said, Thou shouldest have smitten five or six times¹.”

What was David's sin in numbering the people? Or take the account of Moses striking the rock:—“And Moses took the rod from before the Lord, as He commanded him. And Moses and Aaron gathered the congregation together before the rock, and he said unto them, Hear now, ye rebels! must we fetch you water out of this rock? And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he smote the rock twice: and the water came out abundantly, and the congregation drank, and their beasts also².” I really do not think we should have discovered that there was any thing wrong in this, but for the comment that follows: “Because ye believed Me not, to sanctify Me,” &c.; though of course when we are told, we are able to point out where their fault lay.

And in that earlier passage in the history of Moses, when his zeal led him to smite the Egyptian, we are entirely left by the sacred narrative to determine for ourselves whether his action was good or bad, or how far one, how far the other. We are left to a comment, the comment of our own judgment, *external* to the inspired volume.

Or consider the account of Jeroboam's conduct from first to last in the revolt of the ten tribes; or that of the old prophet who dwelt in Samaria. Is it not plain that Scripture does not interpret itself?

Or consider the terms in which an exceedingly great impiety of Ahaz and the high priest is spoken of; and say, if we knew not the Mosaic law, or if we were not told in the beginning of

¹ 2 Kings xiii. 18, 19.

² Numb. xx. 9—11.

the chapter what the character of Ahaz was, whether we should be able to determine, from the narrative itself, whether he was doing a right or a wrong, or an indifferent action. There is no epithet, no turn of sentence which betrays God's view of his deed. It passes in the Scripture narrative, as in God's daily providence, silently. I allude to the following passage:—"And king Ahaz went to Damascus to meet Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, and saw an altar that was at Damascus: and king Ahaz sent to Urijah the priest the fashion of the altar, and the pattern of it, according to all the workmanship thereof. And Urijah the priest built an altar according to all that king Ahaz had sent from Damascus: so Urijah the priest made it against king Ahaz came from Damascus. And when the king was come from Damascus, the king saw the altar; and the king approached to the altar, and offered thereon. And he burned his burnt-offering and his meat-offering, and poured his drink-offering, and sprinkled the blood of his peace-offerings upon the altar. And he brought also the brasen altar, which was before the LORD, from the forefront of the house, from between the altar and the house of the LORD, and put it on the north side of the altar. And king Ahaz commanded Urijah the priest, saying, Upon the great altar burn the morning burnt-offering. . . . and the brasen altar shall be for me to inquire by. Thus did Urijah the priest, according to all that king Ahaz commanded'."

Or, again, how simple and unadorned is the account of St. John Baptist's martyrdom! "Herod had laid hold of John and bound him, and put him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife; for John said unto him, It is not lawful for thee to have her. And when he would have put him to death, he feared the multitude, because they counted him as a prophet. But when Herod's birth-day was kept, the daughter of Herodias danced before them, and pleased Herod. Whereupon he promised with an oath, to give her whatsoever she would ask. And she being instructed of her mother, said, Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger. And the king was sorry: ne-

¹ 2 Kings xvi. 10—16.

vertheless for the oath's sake, and them which sat with him at meat, he commanded it to be given her. And he sent, and beheaded John in the prison. And his head was brought in a charger, and given to the damsel; and she brought it to her mother. And his disciples came, and took up the body, and buried it, and went and told Jesus¹." Not a word of indignation, of lament, or of triumph! Such is the style of Scripture, singularly contrasted to the uninspired style, most beautiful but still human, of the ancient Martyrologies; for instance, that of the persecution at Lyons and Vienne².

St. Paul's journey to Jerusalem, against the warnings of the prophets, is the last instance of this character of Scripture narrative which shall be given. The facts of it are related so nakedly, that there has been room for maintaining that he was wrong in going thither. That he was right would seem certain, from the way he speaks of these warnings: "Behold I go *bound in the spirit* unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there, save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me³;" and also from CHRIST's words in the vision: "Be of good cheer, Paul; for as thou *hast testified of Me* in Jerusalem⁴," &c. Yet though this be abundantly enough to convince us, yet, I confess, the impression conveyed by the disciples at Tyre saying to St. Paul "through the Spirit, that he should not go up to Jerusalem⁵," and of Agapus at Cæsarea, and, when he got to Jerusalem, by his attempt to soften the Jews in showing conformity to the Law, and by his strong words seemingly retracted to Ananias, and by his dividing the Jewish council by proclaiming himself a Pharisee,—the impression, I say, conveyed by all this would *in itself* be (a very false one,) that there was something human in his conduct.

Thus the style of Scripture is plain and colourless, as regards the relation of facts; so that we are continually perplexed what to think about them and the parties concerned in them. We want a comment,—they are evidently but a text *for* a comment,—and

¹ Matt. xiv. 3—12.

² Vide Records of the Church, No. VI.

³ Acts xx. 22, 23.

⁴ Ib. xxiii. 11.

⁵ Ib. xxi. 4.

as they stand may be turned this way or that way, according to the accidental tone of mind in the reader. And often the true comment, when given us in other parts of Scripture, is startling. I think it startling at first sight that Lot, being such as he is represented to be on the whole in the Old Testament, should be called by St. Peter "a just man." I think Ehud's assassination of Eglon a startling act,—the praise given to Jael for killing Sisera, startling. It is evident that the *letter* of the sacred history conveys to the ordinary reader a very inadequate idea of what is recorded, considered as a bodily, substantial, and (as it were) living and breathing transaction.

Equal simplicity is observed in the relation of great and awful events. For instance, consider the words in which is described the vision of God vouchsafed to the elders of Israel. "Then went up Moses and Aaron, and Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel; and they saw the God of Israel: and there was under His feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire-stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel He laid not His hand: also they saw God, and did eat and drink¹." Or consider the account of Jacob's wrestling with the Angel. Or the plain, unadorned way in which the conversations, if I may dare use the word, between God and Moses are recorded, and ALMIGHTY God's laments, purposes of wrath, appeasement, repentance. Or between the ALMIGHTY and Satan, in the first chapter of Job. Or how simply and abruptly the narrative runs, "And [the Serpent] said unto the woman. . . . and the woman said unto the serpent;" or, "And the Lord opened the mouth of the ass, and she said to Balaam. . . . and Balaam said unto the ass²." Minds familiarized to supernatural things, minds set upon definite great objects, have no disposition, no time to indulge in embellishment, or to aim at impressiveness.

And so in like manner the words in which the celebration of the holy Eucharist is spoken of by St. Luke and St. Paul (breaking bread) are very simple: they are applicable to a com-

¹ Exod. xxiv. 9—11.

² Numb. xxii. 28, 29.

mon meal quite as well as to the Sacrament, and they only do not exclude, they in no respect introduce that full and awful meaning which the Church has ever put on them. "As He sat at meat with them, He took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them; and their eyes were opened¹." "They continued stedfastly in the breaking of bread and in prayers²." "The first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread. . . . When He therefore was come up again and had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while even till break of day, so He departed³." "When He had thus spoken, He took bread, and gave thanks to God in the presence of them all; and when He had broken it, He began to eat⁴." "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of CHRIST⁵?" "The Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread, and when He had given thanks He brake it⁶." Now no words can be simpler than these. What is remarkable is the repeated mention of the very same acts in the same order,—taking, blessing or giving thanks, and breaking. Certainly the constant use of the word "break" is very remarkable. For instance, in the ship, why should it be said, "And when He had thus spoken, He took bread, and gave thanks; and when He had *broken* it, He began to eat," since He *alone* eat it, and did not divide it among his fellow-passengers? But supposing the passages had been a little less frequent, so as not to attract attention by their similarity, what could be more simple than the words,—what less adapted to force on the mind any high meaning? Yet these simple words, *blessing, breaking, eating, giving*, have a very high meaning put on them in the Prayer Book, put on them by the Church from the first; and a person may be tempted to say the Church's meaning is not borne out by such simple words. I ask, are they more bare and colourless than the narrative of many a transaction in the Old Testament?

2. So much on the plain and (as it were) unconscious way in which great things are recorded in Scripture. However, it is ob-

¹ Luke xxiv. 30, 31.

² Acts ii. 42.

³ 1b. xx. 8—11.

⁴ Acts xxvii. 35.

⁵ 1 Cor. x. 16.

⁶ 1b. xi. 23, 24.

jected that there is not an allusion to the Church doctrines, even where one would think this must have been, had they been in the inspired writer's mind ; that is, were they part of the divine revelation. For instance, St. John says, " If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness¹." Why (it is asked) is nothing said here concerning Absolution, or the Lord's Supper, as the means of forgiveness? Certainly then the *tone* of the New Testament is unsacramental ; and the impression it leaves on the mind is not that of a Priesthood and its attendant system. Now I conceive that a series of Scripture parallels to this, as regards other matters, might easily be drawn out, all depending on this principle, and illustrating it in the case before us ; viz. that when the sacred writers were aiming at one thing, they did not go out of their way ever so little to introduce another. The fashion of this day indeed, is ever to speak about all religious things at once, and never to introduce one, but to introduce all, and never to maintain reserve about any ; and those who are imbued with the spirit which this implies, doubtless will find it difficult to understand how the sacred writers can help speaking of what is very near their subject, when it is not their subject. Still we must submit to facts which abundantly evidence they could. This omission of the Sacraments in St. Paul and St. John, *so far* as distinct mention is omitted (for they *are* frequently mentioned), as little proves that those Apostles were not aware and thinking of them, as St. James's Epistle is an evidence that he did not hold the doctrine of the Atonement, which is not there mentioned. Or consider how many passages there are in the history, where some circumstance is omitted which one would expect to be inserted. For instance : St. Peter struck off the ear of Malchus, when our LORD was seized. St. John gives the names ; St. Matthew and St. Mark relate the occurrence without the names. This is commonly explained on the ground that St. John writing later than his brother Evangelists, and when all parties were dead, might give the names without exposing St. Peter to any civil inconve-

¹ 1 John i. 9.

niences. True, this is an explanation so far ; but what explains their omitting, and St. John omitting our Lord's miracle in healing the ear, as St. Luke relates it? Was not this to deliver a half account? is it not what would be called unnatural, if it were a question, not of history, but of doctrine?

This relates to a matter of fact: let us review cases in which matters of doctrine, or the doctrinal *tone* of the composition, are in question. Is the tone of Scripture more unfavourable to the doctrine of a Priesthood than it is to the idea of Christianity, such as we are brought up to regard it,—I mean of an established, endowed, dignified Church; and if its establishment is not inconsistent (as it is not) with the New Testament, why should its mysticalness be? Certainly, if *any* thing is plain, it is that Scripture represents, that the very *portion* of all Christians is tribulation, want, contempt, persecution. I do not,—of course not, far from it,—I do not say that the actual present state of the Church Catholic and the text of the New Testament are not reconcilable: but is it not a fact, that the first *impression* from Scripture of what the Church should be, is not fulfilled in what we see around us?

Again: I suppose another impression which would be left on an unbiassed reader by the New Testament would be, that the world was soon to come to an end. Yet it has not. As, then, we submit to facts in one case, and do not exercise our so-called right of private judgment to quarrel with our own consciousness that we do live, and that the world does still go on, why should we not submit to facts in the other instance? and if there be good proof that what the Church teaches is true, and is conformable to given texts of Scripture, in spite of this vague impression from its text; why should we not reconcile ourselves to the conclusion, that that impression of its being opposed to a Sacramental or Priestly system is a false impression, is private and personal, or peculiar to a particular age, untrustworthy, in fact false, just as the impression of its teaching that the world was soon to come to an end is false, because it has not been fulfilled?

Again: I suppose any one reading our Lord's discourses

would, with the Apostles, consider that the Gentiles, even if they were to be converted, yet were not to be on a level with the Jews. The impression His words convey is certainly such. But of this more presently.

Again: it is objected that little is said in the New Testament of the *danger* of sin after baptism, or of the *penitential exercises* by which it is to be met. Well: supposing it for argument's sake; yet let me ask the previous question, Is there much said in the New Testament of sin after baptism at all? I will venture to say, less still,—less about its actually occurring than there is about its prospective danger and its provisional remedies. Till we examine Scripture on the subject, perhaps we have no adequate notion how little the Apostles contemplate sin in the baptized. The argument then proves too much: for if silence proves any thing, it will prove either that Christians who now live do not fall into gross sin, or that those who have so fallen have forfeited their Christianity.

Again: the three first Gospels contain no declaration of our Lord's divinity, and there are passages which tend at first sight the other way. Now, is there one doctrine more than another essential and characteristic of a Christian mind? Is it possible the Evangelists could write any one particle of their records of His life without having the great and solemn truth stedfastly before them, that He was their God? Yet they do not show this. It follows that truths may be in the mind of the inspired writers, which are not discoverable to ordinary readers in the tone of their composition. I by no means deny, that now we know the doctrine, we can gather proofs of it from the three Gospels in question, and can discern in them a feeling of reverence towards our Lord which fully implies it; but no one will say it is on the surface, and so as to strike a reader. I conceive the impression left on an ordinary mind would be, that our SAVIOUR was a super-human being, intimately possessed of God's confidence, but still a creature,—an impression infinitely removed from the truth as really contained and intended in those Gospels.

Again: is the tone of the Epistle of St. James the same as the tone of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians? or that of St. Paul's

Epistle to the Romans as that of the same Apostle's Epistle to the Hebrews? Might they not be as plausibly put in opposition with each other, as the Church system is made contrary to Scripture?

Again: consider what the texts are from which Calvinists are accustomed to argue; such, viz. as speak of God's sovereign grace, without happening to add mention of man's responsibility. Thus: "He who has begun a good work in you will perform it unto the day of the LORD JESUS;" and, "Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation," are taken as irrefragable arguments for final perseverance. If mention of God's grace need not exclude man's freedom in a question of conduct, why need mention of moral qualifications exclude the necessity of sacramental instruments, in a question of spiritual gifts?

Again: if silence implies denial or ignorance of the things passed over; if nothing is the sense of Scripture but what is openly declared; if first impressions are every thing, what are we to say to the Book of Canticles, which nowhere hints, what Scripture nowhere hints afterwards, that it has a spiritual meaning. Either, then, the apparent tone of passages of Scripture is not the real tone, or the Canticles have not the appearance of a sacred book.

Again: is not the apparent tone of the Prophecies of a similarly twofold character, as is shown by the Jewish notion that there were to be two Messiahs, one suffering, and one triumphant?

Another illustration, which deserves attention, lies in the impression David's history in the Books of Samuel conveys, compared with that derived from the Chronicles and the Psalms. I am not speaking of *verbal discrepancies*, or *difficulties* to be reconciled,—that was the subject of the last Lecture,—but of the *tone* of the narrative, and the *impression* thence created in the reader; and I think that it must be allowed that the idea which we have of David from the one document, is very different from that gained from the other two. In the Books of Samuel we have the picture of a monarch, bold, brave, generous, loyal, accomplished, attractive, and duly attached to the cause, and promot-

ing the establishment, of the Mosaic law, but with apparently little permanent and consistent personal religion ; his character is sullied with many sins, and clouded with many suspicions. But in the First Book of Chronicles, and in the Psalms, we are presented with the picture of a humble, tender, devotional, and deeply spiritual mind, detached from this world, and living on the thought and in the love of God. Is the impression derived from the New Testament more unfavourable to Church system (admitting that it *is* unfavourable), than that of the Books of Samuel to David's personal holiness ?

I just now reserved the doctrine of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church, for separate consideration ; let us now turn to it. Their call, certainly their equality with the Jews, was but covertly signified in our LORD's teaching. I think it is plainly there signified, though covertly ; but, if covertly, then what the state of the evidence is for the *Catholicity* of the Christian Church in the Gospels, as much as this (viewed at the greatest disadvantage), will turn out the state of the evidence for its *ritual character* in the Epistles ; and we may as well deny that the Church is Gentile, on the ground that our LORD but indirectly teaches it, as that it is sacramental on the ground that His Apostles indirectly teach it. It is objected that the Church system, the great Episcopal, Priestly, Sacramental system, was an after-thought, a corruption coming upon the simplicity of the primitive and Apostolic religion. The primitive religion, it is said, was more *simple*. More *simple* ! Did objectors never hear that there have been unbelievers who have written to prove that CHRIST's religion was more simple than St. Paul's,—that St. Paul's Epistles are “ a second system ” coming upon the Gospels and changing their doctrine ? Have we never heard that some have considered the doctrine of our LORD's Divinity an addition upon the “ simplicity ” of the Gospels ? Yes : this has been the belief not only of heretics as the Socinians, but of infidels such as the historian Gibbon, who looked at things with less of prejudice than heretics, as having no point to maintain. I think it will be found quite as easy to maintain that the Divinity of CHRIST was an after-thought, brought in by the Greek Platonists and

other philosophers, upon the simple and primitive creed of the Galilean fishermen, as infidels say, as that the Sacramental system came in from the same source, as the rationalists say.—But to return to the point before us. Let it be considered whether a very plausible case might not be made out, by way of proving that our Blessed LORD did *not* contemplate the evangelizing of the heathen at all, but that it was an after-thought, when His Apostles began to succeed, and their ambitious hopes to rise.

If texts from the Gospels are brought to show that it was no after-thought, such as the mustard seed, or the labourers of the vineyard, which imply the calling and conversion of the Gentiles, and the implication contained in His discourse at Nazareth concerning the miracles of Elijah and Elisha wrought upon Gentiles, and His significant acts, such as his complying with the prayer of the Canaanitish woman, and His condescension towards the centurion, and, above all, His final command to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, “and to go teach all nations, baptizing them;” still it may be asked, Did not the Apostles hear our LORD, and what was *their* impression from what they heard? Is it not certain that the Apostles did not gather this truth from His teaching? So far is certain; and it is certain that none of us will deny that nevertheless that truth is clear. Well then, it is plain that important things may be in Scripture, yet not brought out: is there then any reason why we should be more clear-sighted as to another point of doctrine than the Apostles were as to this? I ask this again: Is there any reason that we, who have not heard CHRIST speak, should have a clearer apprehension of the meaning of His recorded discourses on a given point, than the Apostles who did? and if it be said that we have now the gift of the HOLY SPIRIT, which the Apostles had not during our LORD’s earthly ministry, then I ask again, Where is there any promise that we, as individuals, should be brought by His gracious influences into perfect truth from merely employing ourselves on the text of Scripture by ourselves? However, so far is plain, that a doctrine which we see to be plainly contained, nay necessarily presupposed in our LORD’s teaching, did not so impress itself on the Apostles.

These thoughts deserve consideration ; but what I was coming to in particular is this : I wish you to turn in your mind such texts as the following : " Ye shall be witnesses unto Me both in Jerusalem and in all Judæa and in Samaria, and unto *the uttermost part of the earth.*" An objector would say that " the uttermost part of the earth," ought to be translated " uttermost part of the *land,*" that is, the Holy Land. And he would give this reason to confirm it, " How very unlikely that the whole of the world, except Judæa, should be *straitened up into one clause !* Jerusalem, Judæa, Samaria mentioned distinctly, and the whole world brought under one word !" And I suppose the Apostles did understand the sentence to mean only the Holy Land. Certainly they did not understand it to imply the absolute and immediate call of the Gentiles as mere Gentiles.

You will say that such texts as Luke xxiv. 47. are decisive : " that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His Name *among all nations,* beginning at Jerusalem." Far from it ; as men now-a-days argue, they would say it was not *safe* to rely on such texts. " *Among* all nations ;" " *into* or *to* all nations," this need not mean more than that the Jews in those nations should be converted. The Jews were scattered about in those days ; the MESSIAH was to collect them together. This text speaks of His doing so, according to the prophecies, wherever they were scattered. To this the question of the populace relates, " Whither will He go that we shall not find Him ? will He go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles, and teach the Gentiles ¹ " or Greek Jews ? And St. John's announcement, that He died " not for that nation only, but that also He should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad ²." And St. Peter's address " to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." And especially on the day of Pentecost, when the same Apostle addressed the Jews, " devout men dwelling at Jerusalem, out of every nation under heaven ³."

Again : if the words " preach the Gospel to every creature "

¹ John vii. 35.

² Ib. xi. 51, 52.

³ Acts ii. 5.

were insisted on, an objector might say that creature or creation does not mean all men any more than it includes all animals or all Angels, but one part of the creation, the elect, the Jews¹.

Here then are instances of the same concise and indirect mode of stating important doctrine in half sentences or even words, which is supposed to be an objection to the peculiar Church doctrines only. E. g. it is objected that the sacred truth of the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the FATHER, is only contained in the words, "the Spirit of Truth, which *proceedeth from the FATHER*²:" the equality of the SON to the FATHER, in the phrase, "who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery *to be equal with God*," and in the Jews' inference from our LORD's words, "He said that GOD was His Father, making Himself equal with GOD³." The doctrine of original sin depends on a few implications such as this, "*As in Adam all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive*⁴." And in like manner the necessity of the Lord's Supper to salvation upon the sixth chapter of St. John, in which the subject of CHRIST's flesh and blood is mentioned, but not a word expressly concerning that Sacrament, which as yet was future. So also, 1 Cor. x. 16, "The cup of blessing," &c. is almost a parenthesis; and the ministerial power of Absolution depends on our LORD's words to His Apostles, "Whosoever sins ye remit⁵," &c.; and the doctrine of the Christian Altar, upon such words as "If thou bring thy gift to the altar," &c. Now I say all these are paralleled by the mode in which our LORD taught the call of the Gentiles: He said, "Preach the Gospel to every creature." These words *need* have only meant, "Bring all men to Christianity through Judaism;" make them Jews, that they may enjoy CHRIST's privileges which are lodged in Judaism; teach them those rites and ceremonies, circumcision and the like, which hitherto have been dead ordinances and now are living: and so the Apostles seem to have understood them. Yet they meant much more than this; that Jews were to have no precedence of the Gentiles, but the one and the other to be

¹ Vide Rom. viii. 19.² John xv. 26.³ Philip. ii. 6. John v. 18.⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 22.⁵ John xx. 23.

on a level. It is quite plain that our SAVIOUR must have had this truth before His mind, if we may so speak, when He said, "Preach to every creature." Yet the words did not on the surface mean all this. As then they meant more than they seemed to mean, so the words, "I am with you alway," or, "Receive ye the HOLY GHOST," may mean much more than they need mean; and the early Church may, in God's providence, be as really intended to bring out and settle the meaning of the latter, as St. Peter at Joppa, and St. Paul on his journeys, to bring out the meaning of the former.

To this there are other parallels. For instance: who would have conceived that the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead lay hid in the words "I am the God of Abraham," &c.? Why may not the doctrines concerning the Church lie hid in repositories which certainly are *less* recondite? Why may not the Church herself, which is called the pillar and ground of the Truth, be the appointed interpreter of the doctrines about herself?

Again: consider how much is contained, and how covertly, in our SAVIOUR's words, "But ye are clean, but not all;"—or in His riding on an ass, and not saying why.

Here, too, the whole subject of prophecy might be brought in. What doctrine is more important than that of the immaculate conception of our LORD? Yet how is it declared in prophecy? Isaiah said to Ahaz, "Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call His Name IMMANUEL." The first meaning of these words seems not at all to allude to CHRIST, but to an event of the day. The great Gospel doctrine is glanced at (as we may say) through this minor event.

These remarks surely suffice on this subject, viz. to show that the impression we gain from Scripture need not be any criterion or any measure of its true and full sense; that solemn and important truths may be silently taken for granted, or alluded to in a half sentence, or spoken of indeed, yet in such unadorned language that we may fancy we see through it, and see nothing;—peculiarities of Scripture which result from what is the peculiar character of its teaching, simplicity and depth. Yet even

without taking into account these peculiarities of Scripture, it is obvious from what meets us daily in the course of life, how insufficient a test is the surface of any one writing, conversation or transaction, of the full circle of opinions of its author. How different persons are, when we know them, from what they appeared to us in their writings ! how many opinions do they hold, which we did not expect in them ! how many practices and ways have they, how many peculiarities, how many tastes, which we did not expect ! I will give one illustration, which may approve itself to those who are acquainted with the case alluded to. That great philosopher, Bp. Butler, has written a book, as we know, on the *Analogy of Religion*. It is distinguished by a grave, profound, and severe style ; and apparently is not the work of a man of lively or susceptible mind. Now we know from his history, that when Bishop, he put up a Cross in his chapel at Bristol. Could a reader have conjectured this from his work ? At first sight would it not have startled one who knew nothing of him but from his work ? I do not ask whether on consideration he would not find it fell in with his work ; of course it would, if his philosophy were consistent with itself ; but certainly it is not on the surface of his work. Now might not we say that his work contained the *whole* of his philosophy, and yet say that the use of the Cross was one of his *usages* ? In like manner we may say that the Bible is the *whole* of the Divine revelation, and yet the use of the Cross a divine usage.

But this is not all. Some small private books of his are extant, containing a number of every-day matters, such as of course one could not expect to be able to conjecture from his great work ; I mean, matters of ordinary and almost household life. Yet those who have seen these papers are likely to feel a surprise that they should be Butler's. I do not say that they can give any reason why they should not be so, as they are ; but the notion we form of any one whom we have not seen, will ever be in detail very different from the true one.

Another series of illustrations might be drawn from the writings of the ancients. Those who are acquainted with the Greek historians know well that they, and particularly the

gravest and severest of them, relate events so simply, calmly, unostentatiously, that an ordinary reader does not recognize what events are great and what little; and on turning to some modern history in which they are commented on, will find to his surprise that a battle or a treaty, which was despatched in half a line in the Greek author, is perhaps the turning point of the whole history, and certainly known to be so by him. Here is the case of the Gospels with this difference, that they are unsystematic compositions, whereas the Greek historians profess to be methodical.

Again: instances might easily be given of the silence of contemporary writers as to great events of their time, when they might be expected to notice them; a silence which has even been objected sometimes against the fact of those events having occurred, yet, in the judgment of the mass of well-informed men, without any real cogency.

I conclude with two additional remarks. I have been arguing that Scripture is a deep book, and that peculiar doctrines concerning the Church, contained in the Prayer Book, are in its depths. Now let it be remarked in corroboration, first, that the early Church always *did* consider Scripture to be what I have been arguing from the structure of it,—viz. a book with very recondite meanings: this they considered, not merely with reference to its teaching the particular class of doctrines in question, but as regards its entire teaching. They considered that it was full of mysteries. Thus, saying that Scripture has deep meanings, is not an hypothesis invented to meet this particular difficulty, that the Church doctrines are not on its surface, but is an acknowledged principle independent of it.

Secondly, it is also certain that the early Church did herself conceal these same Church doctrines. I am not determining whether or not all her writers did, or all her teachers, or at all times, but merely that viewing that early period as a whole, there is on the whole a great secrecy observed in it concerning such doctrines (e. g.) as the Trinity and the Eucharist; that is, the early Church did the very thing which I have been supposing Scripture does,—conceal high truths. To suppose that

Scripture conceals them, is not an hypothesis invented to meet the difficulty arising from the fact that they are not on the surface; for the early Church, independent of that alleged difficulty, did herself in her own teaching conceal them. This is a second very curious coincidence. If the early Church had reasons for concealment, perchance Scripture has the same; especially if we suppose,—what at the very least is no very improbable idea,—that the system of the early Church is a continuation of the system of those inspired men who wrote the New Testament.

LECTURE VI.

EXTERNAL DIFFICULTIES OF THE CANON AND THE
CATHOLIC CREED, COMPARED.

I AM now proceeding to a subject which will in some little degree take me beyond the bounds which I have proposed to myself in these Lectures, but which, being closely connected with their subject and (as I think) important, has a claim on our attention. The argument which has last been engaging us is this : objection is made to the *indirectness* of the evidence from Scripture on which the peculiar Church doctrines are proved. I have answered, that sacred *history* is for the most part conveyed with as much apparent inconsistency between one part of Scripture and another, as there is inconsistency as regards *doctrine* between Scripture and the Church ; one event being told us here, another there ; so that we have to compare, compile, reconcile, adjust. As then we do not complain of the history being conveyed in distinct, and at times conflicting, documents, so too we have no fair reason for complaining of the obscurities and intricacies under which doctrine is revealed.

Again : in the last Lecture I answered in a similar way the objection, that Scripture was contrary to the teaching of the Church (i. e. to our Prayer Book), not only in *specific statements*, but in *tone* ; for I showed that what we call the *tone* of Scripture, or the impression it makes on the reader, varies so very much according to the reader, that little stress can be laid upon it, and that its tone, and the impression it makes, would tell against a variety of other points undeniably true or firmly held by us, quite as much as against the peculiar Church doctrines.

In a word, it is as easy to show that Scripture has no contents at all, or next to none, as that it does not contain the peculiar Church doctrines,—that the objection which is brought against the Apostolical Succession, or the Sacerdotal Office, tells against

the instruction and information conveyed in Scripture generally. But now I am going to a further point, which has been incidentally touched on, that this same objection is prejudicial not only to the revelation, whatever it is, conveyed in Scripture, but to the text of Scripture itself, to the books of Scripture, to their canonicity, to their trust-worthiness. The line of reasoning entered on in the objection may be carried forward, and, if it reaches one point, may be made to reach the other also. For, first, if the want of method and verbal consistency in Scripture be an objection to the truth of *Church doctrine*, it is also an objection equally to what is called "*orthodox Protestantism*." Further, it is an objection also to the trust-worthiness of the *sacred history*, to the *information* contained in any part of Scripture, which is in great measure indirect. And now, lastly, I say it is an objection to the Bible itself, both because that book cannot be a revelation which contains neither doctrine nor matter of fact, and because the evidence on which its portions are received is not clearer or fuller than its own evidence to facts and doctrines. This is the legitimate consequence of the attempt to invalidate the scripturalness of Catholic doctrine, on the allegation of its want of Scripture proof,—an invalidating of Scripture itself. This is the conclusion to which both the argument itself, and the temper of mind which belongs to it, will assuredly lead those who use it, at least eventually.

There is another objection which is sometimes attempted against Church doctrines, which may be met in the same way. It is sometimes strangely maintained, not only that Scripture does not clearly teach them, but that the Fathers do not clearly teach them; that nothing can be drawn for certain from the Fathers; that their evidence leaves the matter pretty much as it found it, as being inconsistent with itself, or of doubtful authority. This part of the subject has not yet been considered, and will come into prominence as we proceed with the present argument.

I purpose, then, now to enlarge on this point; that is, to show that those who object to Church doctrines, whether from deficiency of Scripture or Patristical proof, ought, if they acted

consistently on their principles, to object to Scripture ; a melancholy truth, if it be a truth ; and I fear it is but too true. Too true, I fear it is *in fact*,—not only that men ought, if consistent, to proceed from opposing Church doctrine to oppose Scripture, but that the leaven which at present makes the mind oppose Church doctrine, *does* set it, or *will* soon set it, against Scripture. I wish to declare what I think will be found really to be the case, viz. that a battle for the Canon of Scripture is but the next step after a battle for the Creed,—that the Creed comes first in the assault, that is all ; and that if we were not defending the Creed, we should at this moment be defending the Canon. Nay, I would predict as a coming event, that minds *are to be* unsettled as to what is Scripture and what is not ; and I predict it, that, as far as the voice of one person in one place can do, I may defeat my own prediction by making it. Now to consider the subject.

How do we know that the whole Bible is the word of God ? Happily at present we are content to believe this, because we have been so taught. It is our great blessedness to receive it on faith. A believing spirit is in all cases a more blessed spirit than an unbelieving. The testimony of unbelievers declares it : they often say, “ I wish I *could* believe ; I should be happier, if I could ; but my *reason* is unconvinced.” And then they go on to speak as if they were in a more exalted though less happy state of mind. Now I am not here to enter into the question of the grounds on which the duty and blessedness of believing rest ; but I would observe, that Nature certainly does give sentence against scepticism, against doubt, nay, against a habit (I say a *habit*) of inquiry, against a critical, cold, investigating temper, the temper of what are called shrewd, clear-headed, hard-headed men, in that, by the confession of all, happiness is attached, not to *their* temper, but rather to confiding, unreasoning faith. I do not say that inquiry may not under circumstances be a duty, as going into the cold and rain may be a duty, instead of stopping at home,—as serving in war may be a duty ; but it does seem to me preposterous to confess that free inquiry leads to scepticism, and scepticism makes one less happy than faith, and

yet that such free inquiry is right. What is right and what is happy cannot on the long run and on a large scale be disjoined. To follow truth can never be a subject of regret; free inquiry does lead a man to regret the days of his childlike faith; therefore it is not following truth. Those who measure every thing by utility, should on their own principles embrace the obedience of faith, for its very expedience; and they should cease this kind of seeking, that they may find.

I say, then, that never to have been troubled with a doubt about the truth of what has been taught us, is the happiest state of mind; and if any one says, that to maintain this is to admit that heretics ought to remain heretics, and pagans pagans, I deny it. For I have not said that it is a happy thing never to *add* to what you have learned, but not happier to *take away*. Now true religion is the summit and perfection of false religions: it combines in one whatever there is of good and true, separately remaining in each. And in like manner the Catholic Creed is for the most part the combination of separate truths, which heretics have divided among themselves, and err in dividing. So that in matter of fact, if a religious mind were educated in and sincerely attached to some form of heathenism or heresy, and then were brought under the light of truth, it would be drawn off from error into the truth, not by losing what it had, but by gaining what it had not,—not by being unclothed, but by being “clothed upon,” “that mortality may be swallowed up of life.” That same principle of faith which attaches it to its original wrong doctrine, would attach it to the truth; and that portion of its original doctrine which was to be cast off as absolutely false, would not be directly rejected, but indirectly rejected in the reception of the truth which is its opposite. True conversion is ever of a positive, not a negative character. And in like manner, if Romanists are to be brought to a more primitive faith, it is by enlarging on the doctrines of the Gospel, which they observe, not by ridicule or scoffing.

All this is a digression: but before returning to the subject, I will just add, that it must not be supposed, from my expressing such sentiments, that I have any fear of argument for the cause

of Christian truth, as if reason were dangerous to it, as if it could not stand before a scrutinizing inquiry. Nothing is more out of place, though it is too common, than such a charge against the defenders of Church doctrines. They may be right, or they may be wrong in their arguments, but argue they do; they are ready to argue; they believe they have reason on their side; but they remind others, they remind themselves, that though argument on the whole will but advance the cause of truth, though so far from dreading it, they are conscious it is a great weapon in their hands; yet that, after all, if a man does nothing more *than* argue, if he has nothing deeper at bottom, if he does not seek God by some truer means, by obedience, by faith prior to conviction, he will either not attain truth, or attain a shallow, unreal view of it, and a weak grasp. Reason will prepare for the reception, will spread the news, and secure the outward recognition of the truth; but in all we do we ought to seek edification, not mere knowledge. Now to return.

I say, it is our blessedness if we have no doubts about the Canon of Scripture, as it is our blessedness to have no doubts about the Catholic Creed. And this *is* at present actually our blessedness as regards the Canon; we have no doubts. Even those persons who unhappily have doubts about the Church system, have no doubts about the Canon,—by a happy inconsistency, *I* say. They *ought* to have doubts on their principles, as I will now show, in the confidence that their belief in the Canon is so much stronger than their disbelief of the Church system, that, if they must change their position, they will rather believe the Church system than go on to disbelieve the Canon.

Now there are two chief heads of objection made against the Catholic or Church system of doctrine and worship, external and internal. It is said, on the one hand, to be uncertain, not only what is in Scripture, but what is in Antiquity, and what not; for the early Fathers, it is objected, who are supposed to convey the information, contradict each other; and the most valuable and voluminous of them did not live till two or three hundred years after St. John's death, while the earlier records are scanty; and moreover that their view of doctrine was from the first cor-

rupted from assignable external sources, pagan, philosophical, or Jewish. And on the other hand the system itself may be accused of being contrary to reason and incredible. In this Lecture I shall consider the former of these two objections.

Objectors, then, speak thus: "We are far from denying," they say, "that there is truth and value in the ancient Catholic system, as reported by the Fathers; but we deny it is *unmixed* truth. We consider it is truth and error mixed together; we do not see why the system of doctrine must be taken together as a whole, so that if one part is true, all is true. We consider we have a right to take it piecemeal, and examine each part by itself; that so far as it is true, it is true not as belonging to the ancient system, but for other reasons, as being agreeable to our reason, or to our understanding of Scripture, not because stated by the Fathers; and, after all, the Church system in question (that is, such doctrines as the mystical power of the Sacraments, the power of the keys, the grace of Ordination, the gifts of the Church, and the Apostolical Succession,) has very little *primitive* authority. The Fathers whom we have, not only might have been of an earlier date, but contradict each other; they declare what is incredible and absurd, and what can reasonably be ascribed to Platonism, or Judaism, or Paganism."

Be it so: well, how will the same captious spirit treat the sacred Canon? in just the same way. It will begin thus:—"These *many* books are put together in *one* book; what makes them one? who put them together? the printers. The books of Scripture have been *printed* together for many centuries. But that does not make them one; what authority had those who put them together to do so? what authority to put just so *many* books, neither more nor less? *when* were they first so put together? on what authority do we leave out the Wisdom or the Son of Sirach, and insert the book of Esther? Catalogues certainly are given of these books in early times: but exactly the same books are not enumerated in all. The language of St. Austin is favourable to the admission of the Apocrypha¹. The Latin Church anciently left out the Epistle to the Hebrews, and

¹ De Doctr. Christ. ii. 13.

the Eastern Church left out the book of Revelation. This so-called Canon did not exist at earliest till the fourth century, between two and three hundred years after St. John's death. Let us then see into the matter with our own eyes. Why should not we be as good judges as the Church of the fourth century, on whose authority we receive it? Why should one book be divine because another is?" This is what objectors would say. Now to follow them into particulars as far as the first head; viz. as to the evidence itself, which is offered in behalf of the divinity and inspiration of the separate books.

For instance; the first Father who expressly mentions Commemorations for the Dead in Christ (such as we still have in substance at the end of the prayer for the Church Militant, where it was happily restored in 1662, having been omitted a century earlier,) is Tertullian, about a hundred years after St. John's death. This, it is said, is not authority early enough to prove that that ordinance is Apostolical, though succeeding Fathers, Origen, St. Cyprian, Eusebius, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, &c. bear witness to it ever so strongly. "Errors might have crept in by that time; mistakes might have been made; Tertullian is but one man, and confessedly not sound in many of his opinions; we ought to have clearer and more decisive evidence." Well, supposing it; suppose Tertullian, a hundred years after St. John, is the first that mentions it, yet Tertullian is also the first that alludes to St. Paul's Epistle to Philemon, and even he without quoting or naming it. He is followed by two writers; one of Rome, Caius, whose work is not extant, but is referred to by Eusebius, who, speaking of *thirteen* Epistles of St. Paul, and excluding the Hebrews, by implication includes that to Philemon; and the other, Origen, who quotes the fourteenth verse of the Epistle, and elsewhere speaks of *fourteen* Epistles of St. Paul. Next, at the end of the third century, follows Eusebius. Further, St. Jerome observes, that in his time some persons doubted whether it was St. Paul's, (as Acrius questioned the Commemorations for the Dead,) or at least canonical, and that from internal evidence; to which he opposes the general consent of external testimony as a sufficient answer. Now, I ask, why

do we receive the Epistle to Philemon as St. Paul's, and not the Commemorations for the faithful departed as Apostolical also? Ever after indeed the times I mention, the Epistle to Philemon was accounted St. Paul's, and so ever after the same time the Commemorations spoken of are acknowledged on all hands to have been observed as a religious duty, down to three hundred years ago. If it be said that from historical records we have good reasons for thinking that the Epistle of St. Paul to Philemon, with his other Epistles, was read from time immemorial in Church, which is a witness independent of particular testimonies in the Fathers, I answer, no evidence can be more satisfactory and conclusive to a well-judging mind; but then it is a *moral* evidence, depending on very little formal and producible proof, and quite as much evidence can be given for the solemn Commemorations of the Dead in the Holy Eucharist which I speak of. They too were in use in the Church from time immemorial also. Persons, then, who have the heart to give up and annul the Ordinance, will not, if they are consistent, scruple much at the Epistle. If in the sixteenth century the innovators on the continent had struck the Epistle to Philemon out of Scripture, they would have had just as much right to do it as to abolish these Commemorations; and those who wished to defend such innovation, would have had just as much to say in its behalf. If it be said they found nothing about such Commemorations in Scripture, even granting this for argument's sake, yet I wonder where they found in Scripture that the Epistle to Philemon was written by St. Paul, except indeed in the Epistle itself. No where; yet they kept the one, they abolished the other,—as far, that is, as human tyranny could abolish it. Let us be thankful that they did not also say, "The Epistle to Philemon is of a private nature, and has no marks of inspiration about it. It is not mentioned by name or quoted by any writer till Origen, who flourished at a time when mistakes had begun, in the third century, and who actually thinks St. Barnabas wrote the Epistle which goes under his name; and he too, after all, just mentions it once, but not inspired or canonical, and elsewhere happens to speak of St. Paul's fourteen Epistles. In

the beginning of the fourth century, Eusebius, without any where naming it" (as far as I can discover), "also speaks of fourteen Epistles, and speaks of a writer one hundred years earlier, who in like manner enumerated thirteen besides the Hebrews. All this is very unsatisfactory. We will have nothing but the pure word of God; we will only admit what has the clearest proof. It is impossible that God should require us to believe a book to come from Him, without authenticating it with the highest and most cogent evidence."

Again: the early Church with one voice testifies in favour of Episcopacy, as an ordinance especially pleasing to God. Ignatius, the very disciple of the Apostles, speaks in the clearest and strongest terms; and those who follow fully corroborate his statements up to between three and four hundred years. And besides this, we know the fact, that a succession of Bishops from the Apostles did exist in all the Churches all that time. At the end of that time one Father, St. Jerome, in controversy has some strong expressions against the divine origin of the ordinance. And this is all that can be said in favour of any other government. Now, on the other hand, what is the case as regards the Epistle to the Hebrews? Though received in the East, it was not received in the Latin Churches till that same St. Jerome's time. St. Irenæus either does not affirm, or denies that it is St. Paul's. Tertullian ascribes it to St. Barnabas. Caius excluded it from his list. St. Hippolytus does not receive it. St. Cyprian is silent about it. It is doubtful whether St. Optatus received it. Now, that this important Epistle is part of the inspired word of God, there is no doubt. But why? Because the testimony of the fourth and fifth centuries, when Christians were at leisure to examine the question thoroughly, is altogether in its favour. I know of no other reason, and I consider this to be quite sufficient: but with what consistency do persons receive this Epistle as inspired, yet deny that Episcopacy is a divinely ordained means of grace?

Again: the Epistles to the Thessalonians are quoted by six writers in the first two hundred years from St. John's death; first, at the end of the first hundred, by three Fathers, Irenæus,

Clement, and Tertullian; and are by implication acknowledged in the last work of Caius, at the same time, and are in Origen's list some years after. On the other hand, the Lord's Table is always called an Altar, and is called a Table only in one single passage of a single Father, during the first three centuries. It is called Altar in four out of the seven Epistles of St. Ignatius. It is called Altar by St. Clement of Rome, by St. Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, Origen, Eusebius, St. Athanasius, St. Ambrose, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Optatus, St. Jérôme, St. Chrysostom, and St. Austin¹. It is once called Table by St. Dionysius of Alexandria. (Johnson's U. S. vol. i. p. 306.) I do not know on what ground we admit the Epistles to the Thessalonians to be the writing of St. Paul, yet deny that the use of Altars is Apostolic.

Again: that the Lord's Supper is a Sacrifice is declared or implied by St. Clement of Rome, St. Paul's companion, by St. Justin, by St. Irenæus, by Tertullian, by St. Cyprian, and others. On the other hand, the Acts of the Apostles are perhaps alluded to by St. Polycarp, and first distinctly noticed by St. Irenæus, then by three writers who soon came after (St. Clement Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and the Letter from the Church of Lyons), and then not till the end of the two hundred years from St. John's death. Which has the best evidence, the Book of Acts, or the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice?

¹ It is perhaps unnecessary to say that the sense of the word Altar (*θυσιαστήριον*) in some of these passages has been contested; as has been contested that the Fathers' works are genuine, or that the Books of Scripture are genuine, or that its text is free from interpolations. There is no one spot in the territory of theology but has been the scene of a battle. Any thing has been ventured and believed in the heat of controversy; and the ultimate appeal in such cases is the common sense of mankind. Ignatius says, *σπονδάσθαι οὖν μὲν εὐχαριστίᾳ χρῆσθαι μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐν ποτήριον εἰς ἑνώσειν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ ἐν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἰς ἐπίσκοπος, ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ καὶ διακόνους τοῖς συνδούλοις μου, ἵνα ὁ ἱεὺς πρᾶσσητε κατὰ Θεὸν πρᾶσσητε.* Ad Phil. 4. Would it have entered into any one's mind, were it not for the necessities of his theory (*θεσιν διαφυλάττων*), to take *εὐχαριστία*, *σὰρξ*, *ποτήριον*, *αἷμα*, *ἐπίσκοπος*, *πρεσβύτεριον*, *διάκονος*, in their ecclesiastical meaning, as belonging to the visible Church, and the one word *θυσιαστήριον* figuratively?

Again : much stress, as I have said, is laid by objectors on the fact that there is so little evidence concerning Catholic doctrine in the *first* years of Christianity. Now, how does this stand, as regards the Canon of the New Testament ? The New Testament consists of twenty-seven books in all, though of varying importance. Of these, fourteen are not mentioned at all till from eighty to one hundred years after St. John's death, in which number are the Acts, the Second to the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Colossians, the Two to the Thessalonians, and St. James. Of the other thirteen, five, viz. St. John's Gospel, the Philippians, the First of Timothy, the Hebrews, and the First of John, are quoted but by one writer during the same period.

Lastly, St. Irenæus, at the close of the second century, quotes all the books of the New Testament but five, and deservedly stands very high as a witness. Now, why may not so learned and pious a man, and so close on the Apostles, stand also as a witness of some doctrines which he takes for granted, as the invisible but real Presence in the holy Eucharist, the use of Catholic tradition in gaining the truth, and the powers committed to the Church ?

I do not see then, if men will indulge that eclectic spirit which chooses part and rejects part of the primitive Church system, what is to keep them from choosing part, and rejecting part of the Canon of Scripture.

But again : it is objected that the evidence of the Church doctrines, whether from Scripture or from Antiquity, is not clear or complete. Now, as far as the question of Scripture is concerned, this point has been already considered at length. The immethodical character of the evidence has been granted, and accounted for. This being the case then, it may be used to protect the proof from Antiquity, as far as it also is immethodical and incomplete. If the Fathers contradict each other in words, so do passages of Scripture contradict each other. Against the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity may be brought the text, "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the Angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son, but the FATHER*¹." And

¹ Mark xiii. 32.

against the doctrine of faith justifying, St. James's declaration, "that works justify."

But this is not all: the objection about the uncertainty of the Fathers, which subserves the ultra-Protestant and Liberal, will be found as prejudicial to the belief in the Canon, as that which we just now examined. There are books, which, great sin as it would be to disbelieve, I think any candid person would grant are presented to us under circumstances less promising than those which introduce the Church doctrines. Take, for instance, the Book of Esther. This book is not quoted once in the New Testament. It was not admitted as canonical by two considerable Fathers, Melito and Gregory Nazianzen. It contains no prophecy, it has nothing on the surface to distinguish it from a mere ordinary history; nay, it has no mark on the surface of its even being a religious history. Not once does it mention the name of God or Lord, or any other name by which the God of Israel is designated. Again, when we inspect its contents, it cannot be denied that there are things in it which at first sight startle one, and demand our faith. Why then do we receive it? Because we have good reason from tradition to believe it to be one of those which our Lord intended, when He spoke of "the prophets¹."

In like manner the Book of Ecclesiastes contains no prophecy, is referred to in no part of the New Testament, and contains passages which at first sight are startling. Again: that most sacred Book, called the Song of Songs, or Canticles, is a continued type from beginning to end. Nowhere in Scripture, as I have already observed, are we told that it is a type; nowhere is it hinted that it is not to be understood literally. Yet it is only as having a deeper and hidden sense, that we are accustomed to see a religious purpose in it. Moreover, it is not quoted or alluded to once all through the New Testament. It contains no prophecies. Why do we consider it divine? For the same reason; because tradition informs us that in our SAVIOUR's time it was included under the title of "the Psalms:" and our SAVIOUR, in St. Luke's Gospel, refers to "the Law, the Prophets, and *the Psalms*."

¹ Luke xxiv. 44.

Objections as plausible, though different, might be urged against the Epistles of St. James, St. Jude, the Second of St. Peter, the Second and Third of St. John, and the Book of Revelation.

Again: we are told that the doctrine of the mystical efficacy of the Sacraments comes from the Platonic philosophers, the ritual from the Pagans, and the Church polity from the Jews. So they do; that is, in a sense in which much more also comes from the same sources. Traces also of the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, and Atonement, may be found among heathens, Jews, and philosophers; for God scattered through the world, before His Son came, vestiges and gleams of His true religion, and collected all the separated rays together, when He set Him on His holy hill to rule the day, and the Church, as the moon, to govern the night. In the sense in which the doctrine of the Trinity is Platonic, doubtless the doctrine of mysteries generally is Platonic also. But this by the way. What I have here to notice is, that the same supposed objection can be and has been made against the books of Scripture too, viz. that they borrow from external sources. Infidels have accused Moses of borrowing his law from the Egyptians or other pagans; and elaborate comparisons have been instituted, on the part of believers also, by way of proving it; though even if proved, and so far as proved, it would show nothing more than this,—that God, who gave His law to Israel absolutely and openly, had secretly given some portions of it to the heathen. Again: an infidel historian accuses St. John of borrowing the doctrine of the Eternal Logos or Word from the Alexandrian Platonists. Again: a theory has been advocated,—by whom I will not say,—to the effect that the doctrine of apostate Angels, Satan and his hosts, was a Babylonian tenet introduced into the Old Testament after the Jews' return from the Captivity; that no allusion is made to Satan, as the head of the malignant Angels, and as having set up a kingdom for himself against God, in any book written before the Captivity; from which circumstance it may easily be made to follow, that those books of the Old Testament which were written after the Captivity are not plenary inspired, and not to be

trusted as canonical. Now, I own I am not at all solicitous to deny that this doctrine of an apostate Angel and his hosts was gained from Babylon; it might still be Divine, nevertheless. God, who made the prophet's ass speak, and thereby instructed the prophet, might instruct His Church by means of heathen Babylon. Again: is not instruction intended to be conveyed to us by the remarkable words of the governor of the feast, upon the miracle of the water changed to wine? "Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but Thou hast kept the good wine until now¹." Yet at first sight they have not a very serious meaning. It does not therefore seem to me a difficulty, nay, nor even unlikely, that the prophets of Israel should, in the course of God's providence, have gained new truths from the heathen, among whom they lay corrupted. The Church of God in every age has been, as it were, on visitation through the earth,—surveying, judging, sifting, selecting, and refining all matters of thought and practice; detecting what was precious amid what is ruined and refuse, and putting her seal upon it. There is no reason, then, why Daniel and Zechariah should not have been taught by the *instrumentality* of the Chaldeans. However, this is stated, and as if to the disparagement of the Jewish Dispensation, by some persons; and under the notion that its system was not only enlarged but altered at the era of the Captivity. And I certainly think as plausibly, as pagan customs were brought to illustrate and thereby to invalidate the ordinances of the Catholic Church; though the proper explanation in the two cases is not exactly the same.

The objection I have mentioned is applied, in the quarter to which I allude, to the Books of Chronicles. These, it has already been observed, have before now been ascribed by sceptics to (what is called) priestly influence: here then is a second exceptionable influence, a second superstition! In the Second Book of Samuel it is said, "the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel; and He moved David against them to say, Go,

¹ John ii. 10.

number Israel and Judah¹." On the other hand, in Chronicles it is said, "*Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel*."² On this a writer, not of the English Church, who is in too high a station to be named, says, "The author of the Book of Chronicles *availing himself* of the learning which he had acquired in the East, and *influenced* by a suitable tenderness for the harmony of the Divine attributes, refers the act of temptation to the malignity of the evil principle." You see in this way a blow is also struck against the more ancient parts of the Old Testament, as well as the more modern. The books written before the Captivity are represented, as the whole discussion would show, as containing a ruder, simpler, more inartificial theology; those after the Captivity, a more learned and refined: God's inspiration is excluded in both cases.

The same consideration has been applied to determine the date and importance of the Book of Job, which has been considered, from various circumstances external and internal, not to be a literal history, but an Eastern story.

But enough has been said on this part of the subject.

It seems then that the objections which can be made to the evidence for the Church doctrines are such as also lie against the Canon of Scripture; so that if they avail against the one, they avail against both. If they avail against both, we are brought to this strange conclusion, that God has given us a revelation, yet revealed nothing,—that at great cost and with much preparation He has miraculously declared His will, that multitudes have accordingly considered they possessed it, yet that, after all, He has said nothing so clearly as to recommend itself as His to a cautious mind, that nothing is so revealed as to be part of a revelation, nothing plain enough to act upon, nothing so certain that we dare assert that the contrary is less certain.

Such a conclusion is a practical refutation of the objection which leads to it. It surely cannot be meant that we should be undecided all our days. We were made for action, and for right action,—for thought, and for true thought. Let us live while we

¹ 2 Sam. xxiv. 1.

² 1 Chron. xxi. 1.

live; let us be alive and doing; let us act on what we have, since we have not what we wish. Let us believe what we do not see and know. Let us forestal knowledge by faith. Let us maintain, before we have proved. This seeming paradox is the secret of happiness. Why should we be unwilling to go by faith? We do all things in this world by faith in the word of others. By faith only we know our position in the world, our circumstances, our rights and privileges, our fortunes, our parents, our brothers and sisters, our age, our mortality. Why should religion be an exception? Why should we be unwilling to use for heavenly objects what we daily use for earthly? Why will we not discern, what it is so much our interest to discern, that trust, in the first instance, in what Providence sets before us in religious matters, is His will and our duty; that thus it is He leads us into all truth, not by doubting, but by believing; that thus He speaks to us, by the instrumentality of what seems accidental; that He sanctifies what He sets before us, shallow or weak as it may be in itself, for His high purposes; that almost all systems have enough of truth, as, when we have no choice besides, and cannot discriminate, to make it better to take all than to reject all; that He will not deceive us, if we thus trust in Him. Though the received system of religion in which we are born were as unsafe as the sea when St. Peter began to walk on it, yet "be not afraid." He who could make St. Peter walk the waves could make even a corrupt or defective creed truth to us, even were ours such; much more can He teach us by the witness of the Church Catholic. It is far more probable that her witness should be true, whether about the Canon or the Creed, than that God should have left us without any witness at all.

LECTURE VII.

INTERNAL DIFFICULTIES OF THE CANON AND THE CATHOLIC CREED COMPARED.

I SHALL now finish the subject I commenced in my last lecture,—the parallel between the objections adduceable against the Catholic system, and those against the Canon of Scripture. It will be easily understood, that I am not attempting any formal and full discussion of the subject, but offering under various general heads, such suggestions as may be followed by those who will. The objections to the evidence for the Canon have been noticed, now let us consider objections that may be made to its contents.

Perhaps the main objection taken to the Church System, is the dislike which men feel for its doctrines. They call them the work of Priestcraft, and in that word is summed up all that they hate in them. Priestcraft is the art of gaining power over men by appeals to their consciences; its instrument is mystery; its subject matter, superstitious feeling. "Now the Church doctrines," it is urged, "invest a certain number of indifferent things with a new and extraordinary power, beyond sense, beyond reason, beyond nature, a power over the soul; and they put the exclusive possession and use of the things, thus distinguished, into the hands of the Clergy. Such, for instance, is the Creed; some mysterious benefit is supposed to result from holding it, even though with but a partial comprehension, and the Clergy are practically its sole expounders. Such still more are the Sacraments, which the Clergy only administer, and which are supposed to effect some supernatural change in the soul, and to convey some supernatural gift." This then is the antecedent exception taken against the Catholic doctrines, that they are mysterious, tending to superstition, and to dependence on a particular set of men. And this objection is urged, not merely as a reason for demanding fair proof of what is advanced, but as a reason for

refusing to listen to any proof whatever, as if it fairly created an insurmountable presumption against the said doctrines.

Now I say, in like manner, were it not for our happy reverence for the Canon of Scripture, we should make like exceptions to many things in Scripture; and, since we do not, we ought not consistently to make these exceptions to the Catholic system; but if we do take such grounds against that system, there is nothing but the strength of habit, good feeling, and our Lord's controlling grace, to keep us from using them against Scripture. This I shall now attempt to show, and with that view, shall cite various passages in Scripture which, to most men of this generation, will appear at first sight strange, superstitious, incredible, and extreme. If then, in spite of these, Scripture is nevertheless from God, so again in spite of similar apparent difficulties, the Catholic system may be from Him also; and what the argument comes to is this, that the minds of none of us are in such a true state, as to warrant us in judging peremptorily what is from God and what is not. We shrink from the accents of His providence with offence, as if they were not His, in consequence of our inward ears being attuned to false harmonies. Now for some instances of what I mean.

1. I conceive, were we not used to the Scripture narrative, that we should be startled at the accounts there given us of demons.—For instance: “And He asked him, What is thy name? And He answered, *My name is Legion*, for we are many¹.”—Again, consider the passage, “When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest and findeth none²,” &c. and in like manner, the account of the damsel who was “possessed of a spirit of divination,” or “Python,” that is of a heathen god, in Acts xvi.; and in connexion with this, St. Paul's assertion “that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God³,” and this as being so literally true that he deduces a practical conclusion from it. “I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils.” But, as regards this instance, one is not at all driven to conjecture,

¹ Mark v. 9.

² Matt. xii. 43.

³ 1 Cor. x. 20.

but one knows it is really the case, that they who allow themselves to treat the inspired text freely, *do* at once explain away, or refuse to admit its accounts of this mysterious interference of evil spirits in the affairs of men. Let those see to it, who call the Fathers credulous for recording similar narratives. If they find fault with the evidence, that is an intelligible objection ; but the common way with objectors is at once and before examination to charge on the narrators of such accounts childish superstition and credulity.

2. If we were not used to the narrative, I conceive we should be very unwilling to receive the account of the serpent speaking to Eve, or its being inhabited by an evil spirit ; or, again, of the devils being sent into the swine. We should scoff at such narratives, as fanciful and extravagant. Let us only suppose that instead of being found in Scripture, they were found in some legend of the middle ages ; should we merely ask for evidence, or merely assume that there was none ? Should we think that it was a case of evidence one way or the other ? Should we not rather say, " This is intrinsically incredible ? it supersedes the necessity of examining into evidence, it decides the case." Should we allow the strangeness of the narrative merely to act as suspending our belief, and throwing the burden of proof on the other side, or should we not rather suffer it to settle the question for us ? Again, should we have felt less distrust in the history of Balaam's ass speaking ? Should we have been reconciled to the account of the HOLY GHOST appearing in a bodily shape, and that apparently the shape of an irrational animal, a dove ? And, again, though we might bear the figure of calling our SAVIOUR a lamb, if but once adopted, as if to show that it was the antitype of the Jewish sacrifices, yet, unless we were used to it, would there not be something repugnant to our present habits of mind in calling again and again our SAVIOUR by the name of a brute animal ? Unless we were used to it, I conceive it would hurt and offend us much, to read of " glory and honour " being ascribed to Him that sitteth upon the Throne and to the Lamb, as being a sort of idolatry, or at least an unadvised way of speaking. It seems to do too much honour to an inferior creature, and to dishonour

Christ. You will see this, by trying to substitute any other animal however mild and gentle. It is said that one difficulty in translating the New Testament into some oriental languages actually is, that the word in them for Lamb does not carry with it the associations which it does in languages which have had their birth in Christianity. Now we have a remarkable parallel to this in the impression produced by another figure, which was in use in primitive times, when expressed in our own language. The ancients formed an acrostic upon our LORD's Greek titles as the SON OF GOD, the SAVIOUR of men, and in consequence called Him from the first letters $\iota\chi\theta\upsilon\varsigma$ or "fish." Hear how a late English writer speaks of it, "This contemptible and disgusting quibble originated in certain verses of one of the pseudo-sibyls. . . . I know of no figure which so revoltingly degrades the person of the SON OF GOD!" Such as this is the nature of the comment made in the farther east on the sacred image of the Lamb. The two objectors may settle it with each other.—But without reference to such peculiar associations which vary with place and person, there is in pure reason a strangeness perhaps in God's allowing symbols at all; and, again, a greater strangeress in His taking a brute animal as the name of His Son, and bidding us ascribe praise to it. Now it does not matter, whether we take all these instances separate or together. Separate, they are strange enough; put them together, you have a law of God's dealings, which accounts indeed for each separate instance; but, as being a law, it is at least not less strange that the brute creation should have so close a connexion with God's spiritual and heavenly kingdom. Here, moreover, it is in place to make mention of the "four beasts" spoken of in the Revelations as being before God's throne. Translate the word "living thing," as you may do, yet the circumstance is not less startling. They were respectively like a lion, calf, man, and eagle. To this may be added the figure of the Cherubim in the Jewish law, which is said to have been a symbol made up of limbs of the same animals. Is it not strange that Angels should be represented under brute images?

¹ Osburn on the Early Fathers, p. 85.

Consider then, if God has thus made use or allowed of brutes in fact and in His teaching, as real instruments and as symbols of spiritual things, what is there strange antecedently in supposing He makes use of the inanimate creation also? If Balaam's ass instructed Balaam, what is there fairly to startle us in the Church's doctrine, that the water of Baptism cleanses from sin, that eating the consecrated Bread is eating His Body, or that oil may be blessed for spiritual purposes, as is still done in our Church in the case of a coronation? Of this I feel sure, that those who consider the doctrines of the Church incredible, will soon, if they turn their thoughts steadily that way, feel a difficulty in the serpent that tempted Eve and the ass that admonished Balaam.

3. We cannot, it seems, believe that water applied to the body really is God's instrument in cleansing the soul from sin; do we believe that at Bethesda, an Angel gave the pool a miraculous power? What God has done once, He may do again; that is, there is no antecedent improbability in His connecting real personal benefits to us with arbitrary outward means. Again, what should we say, unless we were familiarised to it, to the story of Naaman bathing seven times in the Jordan? or rather to the whole system of mystical signs;—the tree which Moses cast into the waters to sweeten them; Elisha's throwing meal into the pot of poisonous herbs; and our SAVIOUR's breathing, making clay, and the like? Indeed, is not the whole of the Bible, Old and New Testament, engaged in a system of outward signs with hidden realities under them, which is only *continued* in the Church's doctrine? Is it not certain then that those who stumble at the latter as incredible, will stumble at the former too, as soon as they learn just so much irreverence as to originate objections as well as to receive them? I cannot doubt that unless we were used to the Sacraments, we should be objecting not only to the notion of their conveying virtue, but to their observance altogether, viewed as mere badges and memorials. They would be called Eastern, suited to a people of warm imagination, suited to the religion of other times, but too symbolical, poetical, or (as some might presume to say) theatrical for us; that there was something

far more plain, solid, sensible, practical, and edifying, in a sermon, or an open profession, or a prayer.

4. Consider the accounts of virtue going out of our LORD, and that, in the case of the woman with the issue of blood, as it were by a natural law, without a distinct application on His part;—of all who touched the hem of His garment being made whole; and further, of handkerchiefs and aprons being impregnated with healing virtue by touching St. Paul's body,—and of St. Peter's shadow being earnestly sought out,—when religion was purest, and the Church's condition most like a heaven upon earth. Can we hope that these passages will not afford matter of objection to the mind, when once it has brought itself steadily to scrutinize the evidence for the inspiration of the Gospels and Acts? Will it not be obvious to say, "St. Luke was not an Apostle; and I do not believe this account of the handkerchiefs and aprons, though I believe the Book of Acts as a whole." Next, when the mind gets bolder, it will address itself to the consideration of the account of the woman with the issue of blood. Now, it is not wonderful that she, poor ignorant woman (as men speak), in deplorable ignorance of spiritual religion (alas! that words should be so misused), dark, and superstitious,—it is not wonderful, I say, that she should expect a virtue from touching our Lord's garment; but that she should *obtain* it by the opus operatum of merely touching, and again that He should even commend her faith, will be judged impossible. The notion of virtue *going out* of Him will be considered as Jewish, pagan, or philosophical. Yes; the *outline* of the story will be believed,—the main fact, the leading idea,—not the details. It will be considered, what has been styled a "Myth." Indeed, if persons have already thought it inherently incredible that the hands of Bishop or Priest should impart a power, or grace, or privilege, if they have learned to call it profane, and (as they speak) blasphemous so to teach with the early Church, how can it be less so, to consider that God gave virtue to an handkerchief, or apron, or garment, though our Lord's? What was it, after all, but a mere earthly substance, made of vegetable or animal materials? How was it more holy because He wore it? *He* was holy, not *it*; it

did not gain holiness by being near Him. Nay : do they not already lay this down as a general principle, that to suppose He diffuses from His Person heavenly virtue is a superstition ? do not they, on this ground, object to the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist ? and on what other ground do they deny that the Blessed Virgin, whom all but heretics have ever called the Mother of God, was most holy in soul and body, from her ineffable proximity to God ? He who gave to the perishing and senseless substances of wool or cotton that grace of which it was capable, should not He rather communicate of His higher spiritual perfections to her in whose bosom He lay, or to those who now possess Him through the Sacramental means He has appointed ?

5. Unless we were used to the passage, I cannot but think that we should stumble greatly at the account of our Lord's temptation by Satan. Putting aside other considerations, dwell awhile on the thought of Satan showing "*all* the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time¹." What is meant by this ? How did he show all, and in a moment ; and if by a mere illusion, why from the top of a high mountain ?

Or again : consider the account of our SAVIOUR's bidding St. Peter catch a fish in order to find money in it, to pay tribute with. What should we say if this narrative occurred in the Apocrypha ? Should we not speak of it as an evident fiction ? and are we likely to do less whenever we have arrived at a proper pitch of unscrupulousness, and what is now-a-days called critical acumen in analysing and disposing of what we have received as divine ? Again : I conceive that the blood and water which issued from our SAVIOUR's side, particularly taken with the remarkable comment upon it in St. John's Epistle, would be disbelieved, if men were but consistent in their belief and disbelief. The miracle would have been likened to many which occur in Martyrologies, and the inspired comment would have been called obscure and fanciful, as on a par with various doctrinal interpretations in the Fathers, which carry forsooth their own condemnation with them. Again : the occurrence mentioned by St. John,

¹ Luke iv. 5.

"Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it (My Name), and will glorify it again. The people, therefore, that stood by and heard it, said that it thundered; others said, An Angel spake to him¹:" this, I conceive, would soon be looked upon as suspicious, did men once begin to examine the claims of the Canon upon our faith. Or again: to refer to the Old Testament. I conceive that the history of the Deluge, the ark, and its inhabitants, will appear to men of modern tempers more and more incredible, the longer and more minutely it is dwelt upon. Or, again, the narrative of Jonah and the whale. Once more, the following narrative will surely be condemned also, as bearing on its face evident marks of being legendary: "And the sons of the prophets said unto Elisha, Behold now, the place where we dwell with thee is too strait for us. Let us go, we pray thee, unto Jordan, and take thence every man a beam, and let us make us a place there, where we may dwell. And he answered, Go ye. And one said, Be content, I pray thee, and go with thy servants. And he answered, I will go. So he went with them. And when they came to Jordan, they cut down wood. But as one was felling a beam, the axe-head fell into the water; and he cried, and said, Alas, master! for it was borrowed. And the man of God said, Where fell it? And he showed him the place. And he cut down a stick, and cast it in thither; and the iron did swim. Therefore said he, Take it up to thee. And he put out his hand, and took it²."

6. Having mentioned Elisha, I am led to say a word or two upon his character. Men of this age are full of their dread of priestcraft and priestly ambition; and they speak and feel as if the very circumstance of a person claiming obedience upon a divine authority was priestcraft and full of evil. They speak as if it was against the religious rights of man (for some such rights are supposed to be possessed by sinners, even by those who disown the doctrine of the political rights of man), as if it were essentially an usurpation for one man to claim spiritual power over another.

¹ John xii. 28, 29.

² 2 Kings vi. 1—7.

They do not ask for the voucher of his claim, for his commission, but think the claim absurd. They so speak, that any one who heard them, without knowing the Bible, would think that ALMIGHTY God had never given such power unto men. Now, what would such persons say to Elisha's character and conduct? Let us recount some few passages in his history, in the Second Book of Kings, and let us bear in mind what has been already observed of the character of the Books of Chronicles. When the little children out of Bethel mocked him, "he cursed them in the name of the LORD¹." This was his first act after entering on his office. Again: Jehoram, the son of Ahab, put away Baal, and walked not in the sins of his father and his mother; but because he did not put away the false worship of Jeroboam, but kept to his calves, his self-appointed priests, altars, and holy days, which he probably thought a little sin, when he was in distress, and called upon Elisha, Elisha said, "What have I to do with thee? Get thee to the prophets of thy father, and to the prophets of thy mother²:" and went on to say, that but for the presence of good Jehoshaphat, "I would not look toward thee nor see thee." This was taking (what would now be called) a high tone. Again: the Shunammite was a great woman; he was poor. She got her husband's leave to furnish a "little chamber" for him, not in royal style, but as for a poor minister of God. It had "a bed and a table and a stool and a candlestick," and when he came that way he availed himself of it. The world would think that she was the patron, and he ought to be humble, and to know his place. But observe his language on one occasion of his lodging there. He said to his servant, "Call this Shunammite." When she came, she, the mistress of the house, "stood before him." He did not speak to her, but bade his servant speak, and then she retired; then he held a consultation with his servant, and then he called her again, and "she stood in the door:" then he promised her a son. Again: Naaman was angered that Elisha did not show him due respect: he only sent him a message, and bade him wash and be clean. Afterwards we find him interpos-

¹ 2 Kings ii. 23.² Ib. iii. 13.

ing in political matters in Israel and Syria. Now, it is not to the purpose to account for all this, by saying he worked miracles. Are miracles necessary for being a minister of God? Are miracles the only way in which a claim can be recognised? Is a man the higher minister, the more miracles he does? Are we to honour only those who minister temporal miracles, and to be content to eat and be filled with the loaves and fishes? Are there no higher miracles than visible ones? John the Baptist did no miracles, yet he too claimed, and gained, the obedience of the Jews. Miracles *prove* a man to be God's minister, they do not *make* him God's minister. No matter how a man is proved to come from God, if he comes from God. If CHRIST is with His ministers, according to His promise, even to the end of the world, so that he that despiseth them despiseth Him, then, though they do no miracles, they are in office as great as Elisha. And if Baptism be the cleansing and quickening of the dead soul, to say nothing of the Lord's Supper, they do work miracles. If God's ministers are then only to be honoured when we *see* that they work miracles, where is place for faith? Are we not under a dispensation of faith, not of sight? Was Elisha great because he was seen to work miracles, or because he could, and did, work them? Is God's minister a proud priest now, for acting as if he came from God, if he *does* come from Him? Yet men of this generation, without inquiring into his claims, would most undoubtedly call him impostor and tyrant, proud, arrogant, profane, and Antichristian, nay, Antichrist himself, if he, a Christian minister, assume one-tenth part of Elisha's state. Yes, Antichrist;—"If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of His household¹?"

7. St. John the Baptist's character, I am persuaded, would startle most people, if they were not used to Scripture; and when men begin to doubt about the integrity of Scripture, it will be turned against the authenticity or the authority of the particular passages which relate to it. Let us realize to ourselves a man living on locusts and wild honey, and with a hair shirt on,

¹ Matt. x. 25.

bound by a leathern girdle. Our LORD indeed bids us avoid *outward* show, and therefore the ostentation of such austerity would be wrong now, of course. But what is there to show that the thing itself would be wrong, if a person were moved to do it? Does not our SAVIOUR expressly say, with reference to the austerities of St. John's disciples, that after His departure His disciples shall resemble them,—“then shall they fast?” Yet, I suppose, most persons would cry out now against the very semblance of the Baptist's life; and why? Those who gave a reason would perhaps call it Jewish. Yet what had St. John to do with the Jews, whose religion was one of joyousness and feasting, not of austerity, and that by divine permission? Surely the same feeling which would make men condemn an austere life now, if individuals attempted it, which makes them, when they read of such instances in the early Church, condemn them, would lead the same parties to condemn it in St. John, were they not bound by religious considerations; and, therefore, I say, if ever the time comes that men begin to inquire into the divinity of the separate parts of Scripture, as they do now scrutinize the separate parts of the Church system, they will no longer be able to acquiesce in St. John's character and conduct as simply right and religious.

8. I conceive that under the same circumstances men will begin to be offended at the passage in the Revelations, which speaks of the “*number of the beast.*” Indeed, it is probable that they will reject the Book of Revelations altogether, not sympathising in the severe tone of doctrine which runs through it. Again: there is something very surprising in the importance attached to the Name of GOD and CHRIST in Scripture. The Name of JESUS is said to work cures and frighten away devils. I anticipate that this doctrine will become a stone of stumbling to those who set themselves to inquire into the trustworthiness of the separate parts of Scripture. For instance, the narrative of St. Peter's cure of the impotent man, in the early chapters of the Acts:—first, “Silver and gold” he says, “have I none; but such as I have, give I thee; In the *Name of JESUS CHRIST of Nazareth* rise up and walk.” Then, “And His *Name* through faith

in his *Name* hath made this man strong." Then the question "By what power, or by what *name*, have ye done this?" Then the answer, "By the *Name* of JESUS CHRIST of Nazareth. even by *It* doth this man now stand here before you whole. there is none other *Name* under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." Then the threat, that the apostles should not "speak at all, nor teach in the *Name* of JESUS." Lastly, their prayer that God would grant "that signs and wonders might be done by the *Name* of His Holy Child JESUS." In connexion with which must be considered St. Paul's declaration, "that at the *Name* of JESUS every knee should bow¹." Again: I conceive that the circumstances of the visitation of the Blessed Virgin to Elizabeth would startle us considerably, if we lost our faith in Scripture. Again: can we doubt but that the account of CHRIST's *ascending* into heaven will not be received by the science of this age, when it is carefully considered what is implied in it? Where is heaven? Beyond all the stars? If so, it would take years for any natural body to get there. We say, that with God all things are possible. But this age, wise in its own eyes, has already decided the contrary, in maintaining, as it does, that He who virtually annihilated the distance between earth and heaven on His SON's ascension, cannot annihilate it in the celebration of the Holy Communion, so as to make us present with Him, though He be on God's right hand in heaven.

9. Lastly, I will mention together a number of doctrinal passages, which, though in Scripture, they who deny that the Fathers contain the pure Gospel, hardly would consider parts of it, if they were but consistent in their free speculations. Such are St. Paul's spiritualizing the history of Sarah and Hagar; his statement of the fire trying every man's work in the day of judgment; his declaring that women must have their heads covered in church, "because of the Angels;" his charging Timothy "before the elect Angels;" his calling the Church "the pillar and ground of the Truth;" the tone of his observations on celi-

¹ Acts iii. iv. Phil. ii. 10.

baey, which certainly, if written by any of the Fathers, would in this age have been cited in proof of "the mystery of iniquity" (by which they mean Romanism) "already working" in an early age; St. John's remarkable agreement with him in the same tone in a passage in the Revelations, not to say our SAVIOUR's; our SAVIOUR's account of the sin against the HOLY GHOST, viewed in connexion with St. Paul's warning against falling away, after being enlightened, and St. John's notice of a sin which is unto death—(this would be considered opposed to the free grace of the Gospel); our LORD's strong words about the arduousness of a rich man's getting to heaven; what He says about binding and loosing; about a certain kind of evil spirit going out only by fasting and prayer; His command to turn the left cheek to him who smites the right; St. Peter's saying that we are partakers of a divine nature; and what he says about CHRIST's going and preaching to the spirits in prison; St. Matthew's account of the star which guided the wise-men to Bethlehem; St. Paul's statement, that a woman is saved through childbearing; St. John's directions how to treat those who hold not "the doctrine of CHRIST;"—these and a multitude of other passages would be adduced, not to prove that Christianity was not true, or that CHRIST was not the SON of GOD, or the Bible not inspired, or not on *the whole* genuine and authentic, but that every part of it was not *equally* divine; that portions, books, particularly of the Old Testament, were not so; that we must use our own judgment. Nay, as time went on, perhaps it would be said that the Old Testament altogether was not inspired, only the New,—nay, perhaps only parts of the New, not certain books which were for a time doubted in some ancient Churches, or not the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Luke, and the Acts, because not the writing of Apostles, or not St. Paul's reasonings, only his conclusions. Next, it would be said, that no reliance can safely be placed on single texts; and so men would proceed, giving up first one thing, then another, till it would become a question what they gained of any kind, what they considered they gained from Christianity as a definite revelation or a direct benefit. They would come to consider its publication mainly as an historical event occurring eigh-

teen hundred years since, which modified or altered the course of human thought and society, and thereby altered what would otherwise have been our state; as something infused into an existing mass, and influencing us in the improved tone of the institutions in which we find ourselves, rather than as independent, substantive, and one, specially divine in its origin, and directly acting upon us. This is what the Age is coming to, and I wish it observed. We know it denies the existence of the Church as a divine institution; it denies that Christianity has been cast into any particular social mould. Well: but this, I say, is not all; it is rapidly tending to deny the existence of any *system* of Christianity either, any creed, doctrine, philosophy, or by whatever other name we designate it. Hitherto it has been usual, indeed, to give up the Church, and to speak only of the covenant, religion, creed, matter, or system of the Gospel; to consider the Gospel as a sort of literature or philosophy, open for all to take and appropriate, not confined to any set of men, yet still a real, existing system of religion. This has been the approved line of opinion in the world for the last hundred and fifty years; but now a further step is about to be taken. The view henceforth is to be, that Christianity does not exist in documents, any more than in institutions; in other words, the Bible will be given up as well as the Church. It will be said that the benefit which Christianity has done to the world, and which its Divine Author meant it should do, was to give an impulse to society, to infuse a spirit, to direct, control, purify, enlighten the mass of human thought and action, but not to be a separate and definite something, whether doctrine or association, existing objectively, integral, and with an identity, and for ever, and with a claim upon our homage and obedience. And all this fearfully coincides with the symptoms in other directions of the spread of a Pantheistic spirit, the religion that is of beauty, imagination, and philosophy, without constraint moral or intellectual, a religion speculative and self-indulgent. Pantheism, indeed, is the great deceit which awaits the Age to come¹.

¹ Vide Tract No. 83, on Antichrist, which represents another side of the development of Pantheism.

Let us then look carefully, lest we fall in with the evil tendencies of the times in which our lot is cast. God has revealed Himself to us, that we might believe: surely His revelation is something great and important. He who made it, meant it to be a blessing even to the end of the world: this is true, if any part of Scripture is true. From beginning to end, Scripture implies that God has spoken, and that it is right, our duty, our interest, our safety to believe. Whether, then, we have in our hands the means of exactly proving this or that part of Scripture to be genuine or not, whether we have in our hands the complete proofs of all the Church doctrines, we are more sure that implicit belief in something is our duty, than that it is not our duty to believe those doctrines and that Scripture as we have received them. If our choice lies between accepting all and rejecting all, which I consider it does when persons are consistent, no man can hesitate which alternative is to be taken. So far then every one of us may say, "Our FATHER which is in heaven gave the world a revelation in CHRIST; we are baptized into His name. He wills us to believe, *because* He has given us a revelation. He who wills us to believe *must* have given us an object to believe. Whether I can prove this or that part to my satisfaction, yet, since I can prove all in a certain way, and cannot separate part from part for certain, I cannot be wrong in taking the whole. I am sure that, if there be error, which I have yet to learn, it must be, not in principles, but in mere matters of detail. If there be corruption or human addition in what comes to me, it must be in little matters, not in great. On the whole, I *must* have God's revelation, and in what I see before me, with whatever incidental errors. I am sure, on the other hand, that the way which the age takes cannot be right, for it tends to destroy revelation altogether. Whether this or that doctrine, this or that book of Scripture is fully proveable or not, that line of objection to them cannot be right, which when pursued destroys Church, Creed, Bible altogether,—which obliterates the very Name of CHRIST from the world. It is then God's will, under my circumstances, that I should believe what, in the way of Providence, has been put before me to believe. God

will not deceive me. I can trust Him. Either every part of the system is pure truth, or, if this or that be an addition, He will (I humbly trust and believe) make such addition harmless to my soul, if I thus throw myself on His mercy with a free and confiding spirit. Doubt is misery and sin, but belief has received **CHRIST'S** blessing."

This is the reflection which I recommend to all, so far as they have not the means of examining the evidences for the Church, Creed, and Canon of Scripture; but I must not be supposed to imply, because I have so put the matter, that those who have the means will not find abundant evidence for the divinity of all three.

LECTURE VIII.

DIFFICULTIES OF JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN FAITH
COMPARED.

I HAVE been engaged in the last two Lectures in showing that the Canon of Scripture rests on no other foundation than the Catholic doctrines, that those who dispute the latter should, if they were consistent,—will, when they learn to be consistent,—dispute the former ; that in both cases we believe, mainly, because the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries unanimously believed, and that we have 'at this moment to defend our belief in the Catholic doctrines merely because they come first, are the first object of attack ; and that if we were not defending our belief in them, we should at this very time be defending our belief in the Canon. Let no one then hope for peace in this day ; let no one attempt to purchase it by concession ;—vain indeed would be that concession. Give up the Catholic doctrines, and what do you gain ? an attack upon the Canon, with (to say the least) the *same* disadvantages on your part, or rather, in fact, with much greater ; for the circumstance that you have already given up the Doctrines as insufficiently evidenced in primitive times, will be an urgent call on you, in consistency, to give up the Canon too. And besides, the Church doctrines may also be proved from Scripture, but no one can say that the Canon of Scripture itself can be proved to be a Canon from Scripture ; no one can say, that Scripture any where enumerates all the books of which it is composed, and puts its seal upon them ever so indirectly, even if it might allowably bear witness to itself.

But here, before proceeding to make some reflections on the state of the case, I will make one explanation and notice one objection. In the first place, then, I must explain myself, when I say that we depend for the Canon and Creed upon the fourth and fifth centuries. We depend upon them thus: As to Scrip-

ture, former centuries do not speak distinctly, frequently or unanimously, except of some chief books, as the Gospels; but we see in them, as we believe, an ever-growing tendency and approximation to that full agreement which we find in the fifth. The testimony given at the latter date is the limit to which all that has been before said converges. For instance, it is commonly said *exceptio probat regulam*; when we have reason to think, that a writer or an age *would* have witnessed so and so, *but for* this or that, and that this or that were mere accidents of his position, then he or it may be said to *tend towards* such testimony. In this way the first centuries tend towards the fifth. Viewing the matter as one of moral evidence, we seem to see in the testimony of the fifth the very testimony which every preceding century gave, accidents excepted, such as the present loss of documents once extant, or the then existing misconceptions which want of intercourse between the Churches occasioned. The fifth century acts as a comment on the obscure text of the centuries before it, and brings out a meaning, which with the help of the comment any candid person sees really to be theirs. And in the same way as regards the Catholic creed, though there is not so much to explain and account for. Not so much, for no one, I suppose, will deny that in the Fathers of the fourth century it is as fully developed, and as unanimously adopted as it can be in the fifth; and, again, there had been no considerable doubts about any of its doctrines previously, as there were about the Epistle to the Hebrews or the Apocalypse; or if any, they were started by individuals, as Origen's about eternal punishment, not by Churches,—or at once condemned by the general Church, as in the case of heresies,—or not about any primary doctrine, such as the Incarnation or Atonement; and all this in spite of that want of free intercourse which occasioned doubts about portions of the Canon. Yet, in both cases, we have at first an *inequality* in the evidence, for what was afterwards universally received as divine;—the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and of Episcopacy, and, again, the four Gospels being generally witnessed from the first; but certain other doctrines being at first rather practised and assumed, than insisted on, as the necessity

of infant baptism, and certain books, as the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, doubted or not admitted in particular countries. And as the unanimity of the fifth century as regards the Canon clears up and overcomes all previous differences, so the abundance of the fourth as to the Creed interprets, develops, and combines all that is recondite or partial in previous centuries as to doctrine, acting similarly as a comment, not, indeed, as in the case of the Canon, upon a perplexed and disordered, but upon a concise text. In both cases, the after centuries contain but the termination of the testimony of the foregoing.

So much in explanation;—the objection I have to notice is this. It is said, that the Fathers might indeed bear witness to a *document*, such as the books of Scripture are, and yet not be good witnesses to a *doctrine*, which is, after all, but an opinion. A document or book is something external to the mind; it is an object that any one can point at, and if a person about two or three hundred years after CHRIST, said, "This book of the New Testament has been accounted sacred ever since it was written," he could be as sure of what he said, as we are at the present day, that the particular Church we now use was built at a certain date, or that the date in the title-page of a certain printed book is to be trusted. On the other hand, it is said, a doctrine does not exist except in the mind of this or that person, it is not a thing you can point at, it is not a something which two persons see at once,—it is an *opinion*; and every one has *his own* opinion. I have an opinion, you have an opinion;—if on comparing notes we think we agree, we call it the same opinion, but it is not the same really, only called the same because similar; and, in fact, probably no two such opinions really do coincide in all points. Every one describes and colours from his own mind. No one then can bear witness to a doctrine being ancient. Strictly speaking, that which he contemplates, witnesses, speaks about, began with himself, it is a birth of his own mind. He may, indeed, have caught it from another, but it is not the same as another man's doctrine, unless one flame is the same as a second kindled from it; and as flame communicated from phosphorus to sulphur, from sulphur to wood, from wood to coal, from coal

to charcoal, burns variously, so, true as it may be that certain doctrines originated in the Apostles, it does not follow that the particular form in which we possess them, originated with the Apostles also. Such is the objection; that the Fathers, if honest men, may be credible witnesses of facts, but not, however honest, witnesses to doctrines.

It admits of many answers:—I will mention two.

1. It does not rescue the Canon from the difficulties of its own evidence, which is its professed object; for it is undeniable, that there are books of Scripture, which in the first centuries particular Fathers, nay, particular Churches did not receive. What is the good of contrasting testimony to facts with testimony to opinions, when we have not, in the case of the Canon, that clear testimony to the fact which the objection supposes? The first Fathers, in the midst of the persecutions, had not, as I have said, the time and opportunity to ascertain always what was inspired and what was not; and since nothing but an agreement of many, of different countries, will prove to us what the Canon is, we must betake ourselves, of necessity, to the fourth and fifth centuries, to those centuries which did hold those very doctrines, which, it seems, are to be rejected as superstitions and corruptions. But if the Church then was in that miserable state of superstition, or rather popery, which belief in those doctrines is supposed to imply, then, I must contend, that blind bigotry and ignorance were not fit judges of what was inspired and what was not. I will not trust the judgment of a worldly-minded partizan, or a crafty hypocrite, or a credulous fanatic in this matter. Unless then you allow those centuries to be tolerably free from doctrinal corruptions, I conceive, you cannot use them as evidence of the canonicity of the Old and New Testament, as we have them; but if you do consider the fourth and fifth centuries enlightened enough to decide on the Canon, I want to know *why* you call them not enlightened in doctrine? The only reason commonly given is, that their Christianity contains many notions and many usages and rites not in Scripture, and which because not in Scripture, are to be considered, it seems, as if *against* Scripture. But this surely is no sound argument, unless it is true also that the canonicity itself of

the Old and New Testament, not being declared in Scripture, is therefore unscriptural. I consider then that the same habit of mind, whether we call it cautious or sceptical, which quarrels with the testimony for Catholic doctrine, because a doctrine is an *opinion* and not an *object*, ought also in consistency to quarrel with the testimony for the Canon, as being that of an age which on its own principles was superstitious and uncritical.

2. Granting then, that Scripture is an external object which can be appealed to and witnessed, yet it is not witnessed generally till (according to the objection in question) a blind and superstitious age, and, therefore, an age whose testimony on account of such superstition is not satisfactory. But again: the doctrines of the Church are after all not mere matters of opinion, they were not mere ideas in the mind which no one could appeal to, each individual having his own, but they were external facts, quite as much as the books of Scripture,—how so? Because they were embodied in rites and ceremonies. A usage, custom, or monument, has the same kind of identity, is in the same sense common property, and admits of a common appeal, as a book. When a writer appeals to the custom of the Sign of the Cross, or the Baptism of infants, or the Sacrifice or the Consecration of the Eucharist, or Episcopal Ordination, he is not speaking of an opinion in his mind, but of something external to it, and is as trustworthy as when he says that the Acts of the Apostles is written by St. Luke. Now such usages more or less involve the doctrines in question. Is it not implied, for instance, in the fact of priests only consecrating the Eucharist, that it is a gift which others have not? in the Eucharist being offered to God, that it is an offering? in penance being exacted of offenders, that it was right to impose it? in children being exorcised, that they are by nature children of wrath and inhabited by Satan? On the other hand, when the Fathers witness to the *inspiration* of Scripture, they are surely as much witnessing to a mere doctrine, not to the book itself, but to an opinion, as when they witness to the grace of Baptism.

Again, the Creed is a document the same in kind as Scripture, though its wording be not fixed and invariable, or its language.

It admits of being appealed to, and is appealed to by the early Fathers, as Scripture is. If Scripture was written by the Apostles, because the Fathers say so (as it is), why was not the Creed taught by the Apostles, because the Fathers say so? The Creed is no opinion in the mind, but a form of words pronounced many times a day, at every baptism, at every communion, by every member of the Church;—is it not common property as much as Scripture?

Once more; if Church doctrine is but an opinion, how is it there is such a thing as Catholic consent about it? If, in spite of its being subjective to the mind, Europe, Asia, and Africa agree together in the fourth and fifth centuries (to say nothing of earlier times), why should its subjective character create an antecedent objection to agreement as to it between the fourth century and the first?

Granting then, that external facts can be testified in a way in which opinions cannot be, yet the Church doctrines are not mere opinions, but ordinances; and though the books of Scripture themselves are an external fact, yet they are not all of them witnessed by all writers till a late age, and their canonicity and inspiration are but doctrines, and open to the objections, whatever they are, to which doctrines lie open.

And now, having said as much as is necessary on these subjects, I will make some remarks on the state of the case as I have represented it, and thus shall bring to an end the train of thought in which these Lectures have hitherto been engaged. Let us suppose it proved, then, as I consider it has been proved, that many difficulties are connected with the evidence for the Canon, that we might have clearer evidence for it than we have; and again, let us grant that there are many difficulties connected with the evidence for the Church doctrines, that they might be more clearly contained in Scripture, nay, in the extant writings of the first three centuries, than they are. This being assumed, I observe as follows:—

1. There is something very arresting and impressive in the fact, that there should be these difficulties attending the two great instruments of religious truth which we enjoy. We are all

of us taught from the Bible and from the Prayer Book : it is from these that we get our knowledge of God. We are sure they contain a doctrine which is from Him. We are sure of it ; but *how* do we know it ? We are sure the doctrine is from Him, and (I hesitate not to say) by a supernatural, divinely inspired assurance ; but *how* do we know the doctrine is from Him ? When we go to inquire into the reasons in argument, we find that the Prayer Book rests upon the Bible, and the Bible rests on testimony ; that the Church doctrines, which the Prayer Book contains, are to be gathered from Scripture, and that the books of Scripture which make up the Bible are to be gathered from history ; and further, that those doctrines might have been more clearly stated in the Bible, and the books of the Bible more clearly witnessed by Antiquity. I say, there is something very subduing in this remarkable coincidence, which cannot be accidental. We have reason to believe that God, our Maker and Governor, has spoken to us by revelation ; yet, why has He not spoken more clearly ? He has given us doctrines, which are but obscurely gathered from Scripture, and a Scripture which is but obscurely gathered from history. It is not a single fact, but a double fact ; it is a coincidence. We have two informants, and both leave room for doubt. God's ways surely are not as our ways.

2. This is the first reflection which rises in the mind on the state of the case. The second is this : that, most remarkable it is, the Jews were left in the same uncertainty about CHRIST, in which we are about His doctrine. The precept "*Search the Scriptures,*" and the commendation of the Bereans, who "*sought the Scriptures daily,*" surely implies that divine truth was not on the surface of the Old Testament. We do not search for things which are before us, but for what we have lost, or have to find. The whole system of the prophecies left the Jews (even after CHRIST came) where we are, in doubt. The Sun of righteousness did not at once clear up the mists from the prophetic word. It was a dark saying to the many, after He came, as well as before. It is not to be denied that there were and are many real difficulties in the way of the Jews admitting that Jesus

CHRIST is their Messiah. The Old Testament certainly does speak of the Messiah as a temporal monarch, and a conqueror of this world. *We* are accustomed to say that the prophecies must be taken *spiritually*; and rightly do we say so. True: yet does not this look like an evasion, to a Jew? Is it not much more like an evasion, though it be not, than to say (what we *do* say, and rightly) that rites remain, *though* Jewish rites are done away, because *our* rites are not Jewish but spiritual, gifted with the Spirit, channels of grace? The Old Testament certainly spoke as if, when the Church expanded into all nations, yet that those nations should be inferior to the Jews, even if admitted into the Church; and so St. Peter understood it till he had the vision. Yet when the Jews complained, instead of being soothed and consoled, they were met with language such as this: "Friend, I do thee no wrong. . . . Is it not lawful for Me to do what I will with Mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good?" "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to Him that formed it, Why hast Thou made me thus?"—Again: why were the Jews discarded from God's election? for *keeping* to their Law. Why, this was the very thing they were *told* to do, the very thing which, if not done, was to be their ruin. Consider Moses' words: "If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, The LORD thy God; then the LORD will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues, and of long continuance, and sore sicknesses, and of long continuance¹." Might they not, or rather did they not bring passages like this as an irrefragable argument against Christianity, that they were told to give up their law, that law which was the charter of their religious prosperity? Might not their case seem a *hard* one, judging by the surface of things and without reference to "the hidden man of the heart?" *We* know how to answer this objection: we say, Christianity lay *beneath* the letter; that the letter slew those who for whatever cause went

¹ Matt. xx. 13—15. Rom. ix. 20.² Deut. xxviii. 58, 59.

by it; that when CHRIST came, He shed a light on the sacred text, and brought out its secret meaning. Now, is not this just the case I have been stating, as regards Catholic doctrines, or rather a much stronger case? The doctrines of the Church are not hidden so deep in the New Testament as the Gospel doctrines are hidden in the Old; but they are hidden; and I am persuaded that were men but consistent, who oppose the Church doctrines as being unscriptural, they would vindicate the Jews for rejecting the Gospel. Much might be said on this subject: I will but add, by way of specimen, how such interpretations as our LORD's of "I am the God of Abraham," &c. would startle and offend reasoning men. Is it not much further from the literal force of the words than the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession, from the words, "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world?" In the one case we argue, "Therefore, the Apostles are in one sense *now* on earth, because CHRIST says, 'with you *alway*;' " in the other, CHRIST Himself argues, "therefore in one sense the bodies of the patriarchs are still alive; for God calls Himself *their* God." We say, "therefore the Apostles live in their successors." CHRIST implies, "therefore the body never died, therefore it will rise again." His own divine mouth shows us that doctrines may be in Scripture, though they require a multitude of links to draw them thence. It must be added that the Sadducees *did* profess (what they would call) a plain and simple creed; they recurred to Moses and went by Moses, and rejected at least all additions to what was on the surface of Moses' writings, and thus they rejected what really was in Moses, though not on the surface. They denied the resurrection; they had no idea that it was contained in the books of Moses.

Here, then, is another singular instance of the same procedure on the part of Divine Providence. That Gospel, which was to be "the glory of His people Israel¹," was a stumbling-block to them, as for other reasons, so especially *because* it was not on the *surface* of the Old Testament. And all the compas-

¹ Luke ii. 32.

sion (if I may use the word) they received from the Apostles for their perplexity was, "because they *knew* Him not, nor yet the voice of the Prophets which are read every Sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning Him¹." Or again: "Well spake the HOLY GHOST by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand²," &c. Or when the Apostles are mildest: "I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from CHRIST for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh;" or, "I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge³." And it is remarkable that the record of their anxiety is preserved to us; an anxiety which many of us would call just and rational, many would pity, but which the inspired writers treat with a sort of indignation and severity. "Then came the Jews round about Him, and said unto Him, How long dost Thou make us to doubt⁴?" or more literally, "How long dost Thou keep our soul in suspense? If Thou be the CHRIST, *tell us plainly*." CHRIST answers by referring to His works, and by declaring that His sheep *do* hear and know Him, and follow Him. If any one will seriously consider the intercourse with our LORD and the Pharisees, he will see that, not denying their immorality and miserable pride, yet that they had just reason to complain (as men now speak) that the Gospel was not preached to them, that the Truth was not placed before them clearly and fully and uncompromisingly and intelligibly and logically, that they were bid to believe on weak arguments and fanciful deductions.

This then, I say, is certainly a most striking coincidence in addition. Whatever perplexity any of us may feel about the evidence of Scripture or of Church doctrine, we see it is what is represented in Scripture as the lot of the Jews too; and this circumstance, while it shows that it is a sort of law of God's pro-

¹ Acts xiii. 27.

² 1b. xxviii. 25, 26.

³ Rom. ix. 2, 3; x. 2.

⁴ John x. 24.

vidence¹, and so affords an additional evidence of the truth of the revealed system by its harmony, also serves to quiet and console, and moreover to awe and warn us. Doubt and difficulty, as regards evidence, seems our lot: the simple question is, What is our duty under it? Difficulty is our lot, as far as we take on ourselves to inquire; the multitude are not able to inquire, and escape the trial; but when men inquire, this trial at once comes upon them. And surely we may use the parable of the Talents to discover what our duty is under the trial. Do not those who refuse to go by the hints and probable meaning of Scripture hide their talent in a napkin? and will they be excused?

3. Now, in connexion with what has been said, observe the singular coincidence, or rather appositeness of what Scripture enjoins about going by *faith* in religious matters. The difficulties which exist in the evidence give a deep meaning to the exhortation. Scripture is quite aware of the difficulties. Objections can be brought against its own inspiration, its canonicity, against revealed doctrines, as in the case of the Jews against the Messiahship of JESUS CHRIST. It knows them all: it has provided against them, by recognizing them. It says, "Believe," because it knows that, unless we believe, there is no means of divine knowledge. If we will doubt, that is, if we will not allow evidence to be sufficient which merely results in a balance on the side of revelation; if we will determine that no evidence is enough to prove revealed doctrine but what is overpowering; if we will not go by evidence in which there are (so to say) three chances for revelation and only two against, we cannot be Christians; we shall miss CHRIST either in His inspired Scriptures, or in His doctrines, or in His ordinances.

To conclude: our difficulty and its religious solution is contained in the sixth chapter of St. John. After our LORD had declared what all who heard seemed to feel to be a hard doctrine, some in offence and disgust left Him. Our LORD said to the

¹ For the reasons of this indirect mode of teaching, the reader is referred to Tract 80.

Twelve most tenderly, "Will ye also go away?" St. Peter promptly answered, No : but observe on what ground he put it : "LORD, *to whom* shall we go?" He did not bring forward evidences of our LORD's mission, though he knew of such. He knew of such in abundance, in the miracles that He did : but still questions might be raised about the miracles of others, such as Simon the sorcerer, or of vagabond Jews, or about the force of the evidence from miracles itself. This was not the evidence on which he rested, but this,—that if CHRIST was not to be trusted, there was nothing in the world to be trusted ; and this was a conclusion repugnant both to his reason and his heart. He had within him ideas of greatness and goodness, holiness and eternity,—he had a love of them,—he had an instinctive hope and longing after their possession. Nothing could convince him that this unknown good was a dream. Eternal life was the object which his soul, as far as it had learned to realize and express its wishes, supremely longed for. In CHRIST he found what he wanted. He says, "LORD, to whom *shall* we go?" implying he must go somewhere. CHRIST had asked, "Will ye also go *away*?" He only spoke of leaving *Him* ; but in St. Peter's thought to leave Him was to go somewhere else. He only thought of leaving Him *by* taking another god. That negative state of neither believing nor disbelieving, neither acting this way nor that, which is so much in esteem now, did not occur to his mind as possible. The fervent Apostle knew not what scepticism was. With him, his course was at best but a *choice of difficulties*, of difficulties perhaps, but still a choice. He knew of no course without a choice,—choice he must make. Somewhither he must go : whither else? If CHRIST could deceive him, to whom should he go? His ways might be dark, His words often perplexing, but still he found in Him what he found nowhere else,—amid difficulties a realization of his inward longings. "Thou hast the words of eternal life." So far he saw. He might have misgivings at times ; he might have permanent and in themselves insuperable objections ; still, in spite of such objections, in spite of the assaults of unbelief, on the whole, he saw that in CHRIST which was positive, real, and satisfying. He saw it nowhere

else. "Thou," he says, "hast the words of eternal life; and we *have believed* and *have known* that Thou art the CHRIST, the SON of the Living God." As if he said, "We will stand by what we believed and knew yesterday,—what we believed and knew the day before. A sudden gust of new doctrines, a sudden inroad of new perplexities shall not unsettle us. We *have believed*, we *have known*: we cannot collect together all the evidence, but this is the abiding impression on our minds. We feel that it is better, safer, truer, pleasanter, more blessed to cling to Thy feet, O merciful SAVIOUR, than to leave Thee. Thou *canst not* deceive us; it is impossible. We will hope in Thee against hope, and believe in Thee against doubt, and obey Thee in spite of gloom."

Now, what are the feelings I have described but the love of CHRIST? Thus love is the parent of faith. We believe in things we see not, from love of them: if we did not love, we should not believe. Faith is reliance on the word of another; the word of another is in itself a faint evidence compared with that of sight or reason. It is influential only when we cannot do without it. We cannot do without it, when it is our informant about things which we cannot do without. Things we cannot do without, are things which we desire. They who feel they cannot do without the next world, go by faith (not that sight would not be better), because they have no other means of knowledge to go by. "To whom shall they go?" If they will not believe the word preached to them, what other access have they to the next world? Love of God led St. Peter to follow CHRIST, and love of God and CHRIST leads men now to love and follow the Church.

Let us then say, If we give up the Gospel, as we have received it, in the Church, to whom shall we go? It has the words of eternal life in it: where else are they to be found? Is there any other religion to choose but that of the Church? Shall we go to Mahometanism or Paganism? But we may seek some heresy or sect: true, we may: but why are they more sure? are they not a part, while the Church is the whole? Why is the part true, if the whole is not? Why is not that evidence

trustworthy for the whole, which is trustworthy for a part? Sec-taries commonly give up the Church's doctrines, and go by the Church's Bible; but if the doctrines cannot be proved true, nei-ther can the Bible: they stand or fall together. If we begin, we must soon make an end. On what consistent principle can I give up part and keep the rest? No: I see a great Work be-fore me, professing to be the work of that God whose being and attributes I feel within me to be real. Why should not this great sight be,—what it professes to be,—His presence? *Why* should not the Church be divine? The burden of proof surely is on the other side. I will accept her doctrines, and her rites, and her Bible,—not one and not the other, but all,—till I have clear proof that she is mistaken. It is, I feel, God's will that I should do so; and besides, I love these her posses-sions,—I love her Bible, her doctrines, and her rites, and *there-fore* I BELIEVE.

END OF THE FIRST PART OF THESE LECTURES.

These Tracts are continued in Numbers, and sold at the price of 2d. for each sheet, or 7s. for 50 copies.

LONDON: PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1838.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John Square, London.

The following Works, all in single volumes, or pamphlets, and recently published, will be found more or less to uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in these Tracts :—

- Bp. Taylor on Repentance, by Hale.—*Rivingtons*.
Bp. Taylor's Golden Grove.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, with translation.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Pusey on Cathedrals and Clerical Education.—*Roake & Varty*.
Hook's University Sermons.—*Talboys, Oxford*.
Pusey on Baptism (*published separately*).—*Rivingtons*.
Newman's Sermons, 3 vols.—*Rivingtons*.
Newman on Romanism, &c.—*Rivingtons*.
The Christian Year.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Lyra Apostolica.—*Rivingtons*.
Perceval on the Roman Schism.—*Leslie*.
Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions.—*Duncan*.
Dodsworth's Lectures on the Church.—*Burns*.
Newman on Suffragan Bishops.—*Rivingtons*.
Keble's Sermon on Tradition.—*Rivingtons*.
Memoir of Ambrose Bonwick.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer.—*Rivingtons*.
Law's first and second Letters to Hoadly.—*Rivingtons*.
Bp. Andrews's Devotions. Latin and Greek.—*Pickering*.
Hook's Family Prayers.—*Rivingtons*.
Herbert's Poems and Country Pastor.
Evans's Scripture Biography.—*Rivingtons*.
Le Bas' Life of Archbishop Laud.—*Rivingtons*.
Jones (of Nayland) on the Church.
Bp. Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration.—*Rivingtons*.
Bp. Beveridge's Sermons on the Ministry and Ordinances.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Bp. Jolly on the Eucharist.
Fulford's Sermons on the Ministry, &c.—*Rivingtons*.
Rose's Sermons on the Ministry.—*Rivingtons*.
A Catechism on the Church.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Russell's Judgment of the Anglican Church.—*Baily*.
Poole's Sermons on the Creed.—*Grant, Edinburgh*.
Sutton on the Eucharist.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Leslie on the Regale and Pontificate.—*Leslie*.
Pusey's Sermon on November 5.—*Rivingtons*.
Bishop Wilson's Sacra Privata.—*Parker, Oxford*.

Larger Works which may be profitably studied.

- Bishop Bull's Sermons.—*Parker, Oxford*.
Bishop Bull's Works.—*University Press*.
Waterland's Works.—*Do*.
Wall on Infant Baptism.—*Do*.
Pearson on the Creed.—*Do*.
Leslie's Works.—*Do*.
Bingham's Works.—*Straker, London*.
Palmer on the Liturgy.—*University Press*.
Palmer on the Church.—*Rivingtons*.
Hooker, ed. Keble.—*Do*.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

INDICATIONS OF A SUPERINTENDING PROVIDENCE IN THE PRESERVATION OF THE PRAYER BOOK AND IN THE CHANGES WHICH IT HAS UNDER- GONE.

PART I.

EXPRESSIONS OF REPENTANCE INTRODUCED INTO OUR LITURGY.

1. Whether a Divine purpose be ascertainable.
2. Such an enquiry particularly necessary at present.
3. The three divisions of the argument.
4. That we have given us the language of servants rather than sons.
5. The Collects.
6. Verbal alterations.
7. Commencement of our Liturgy.
8. The general tone and spirit of our Prayer Book.
9. The Sunday Lessons.
10. Changes in the Rubric.
11. Omission of anointing at Baptism and Confirmation.
12. Changes in the Visitation of the Sick.
13. Concluding remarks.

PART II.

LESSONS OF OBEDIENCE INTRODUCED INTO OUR LITURGY.

1. Recapitulation of the general point of view in which the subject is treated.
2. Duty of considering these changes as a Divine work.
3. Warnings introduced against the "lawlessness" of the last days.
4. Scripture and tradition combined in the Prayer Book.

5. The Collects for Advent.
6. Other new Collects.
7. The Collects for Saints' days.
8. Verbal alterations on this subject.
9. Omission of the Day of St. Mary Magdalene.
10. The Epistles and Gospels.
11. Service for Passion week.
12. The vow of obedience at Baptism new.
13. Other peculiarities new in the Baptismal service.
14. The Decalogue in the Communion.
15. The general bearing of this argument on the former.
16. Reflections.

PART III.

EXTERNAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CHURCH COINCIDING WITH INTERNAL CHANGES.

1. Such mutual adaptation and concurrence the mark of design.

Considered with regard to the first point of repentance.

2. Apparent objections to our being supposed in a state of servitude.
3. Suffering the privilege of Sons.
4. The strength of the Church in persecution.
5. Confirmed by the history of our own Church.
6. Her feebleness and state of servitude.
7. That states of servitude are Divine appointments.
8. Such best suited to the condition of the Church.

Considered with regard to the second point, of Obedience.

9. Lessons of obedience the corrective to the tendencies of the age.
10. Our situation a trial of obedience.
11. Our recovery of lost privileges depends on obedience.
12. Dutiful allegiance to our own Church in particular.
13. Especially necessary at the present crisis.
14. Difficulty of realizing sanguine hopes.
15. The voice of warning.

PART I.

EXPRESSIONS OF REPENTANCE INTRODUCED INTO OUR LITURGY.

1. *Whether a Divine purpose be ascertainable.*

THE expression used by the Parliament of that day, respecting the first Book of king Edward, was, that it had been done "by the aid of the HOLY GHOST with mutual agreement." Such we may suppose was as it were the echo of God's voice in His Church, and that in these words that assembly, then perhaps to be considered Catholic, prophesied; though, in so doing, they, like Caiaphas of old, knew not the full meaning of their words. But these we may adopt in their amplest signification, nothing doubting but that, by the superintending care of CHRIST in His Church, there has been in that, and other circumstances of change, a controlling Power beyond the reach of man's wisdom; provisions against future evils in the dark womb of time, and adaptations to the existing condition of the Church, beyond what entered into the thoughts of those concerned.

The object of the present enquiry is to ascertain whether, after the lapse of time, we may not obtain some slight clue to the object of such dispensations; whether there are not discernible some remarkable indications of such a *presiding* Hand, not only controlling the tide of popular changes which have come over the Church, so as to have preserved to us that dispensation under which we now live, but also regulating and directing those changes to meet the wants of succeeding ages.

Had these revolutions been produced by persons acting in the largeness of human wisdom, and by forethought directing their views to one great design, and that design peculiarly suitable to the wants of the Church, even in this case we should have to acknowledge that superintending Hand in which are the hearts

of men. But if this does not appear to have been the case, excepting on some particular occasions, yet, notwithstanding, at one time by the aid of persons supporting the Catholic Truth, at another by that of those opposing it, at one time by the care of reverential men, at another by the passions of the inconsiderate, there may be traced the predominance of one great and overruling purpose:—And if such a Providential Power, now converting and then controlling; now amalgamating, then neutralizing; in short, either by maturing or by frustrating the thoughts of men, has throughout, so far as we can discern, made all things to work to one great end, and that an end peculiarly suitable to our condition—if such be the case, then surely such an enquiry as the present may do something towards regulating the feelings with which we regard those events, and pointing out the line of conduct which our position requires.

I am aware that such an investigation demands the greatest circumspection and reverence, for although we have the promise that CHRIST shall be with His Church to the end of the world, yet therein, as in His natural Providence, “His ways are in the deep waters, and His footsteps are not known.” But if even in our lives as individuals, where we can still less comprehend in our view the lengthened bearing or end of the circumstances which encompass us, yet even in the short course of our existence on earth we may trace in past events manifest Providential leadings, and something of a design with respect to ourselves—much more may we suppose that such indications of God’s care may be discerned in the protection of His Church, where we have entire centuries through which to mark the footsteps of a Divine Governor. And if in the former case it be considered the part of wisdom and piety, in a review of our life, to divert the attention from persons and events, and thus divesting ourselves of human passions and prejudices, to acknowledge and discern the Hand of God, and to look upon apparent contingencies only as the instruments which He uses in conducting the great ends of His wisdom; in like manner also, with regard to the history and position of our Church, to turn our thoughts from man to God, is one of the best means of learning to judge and to feel correctly: in

short, we ought to be very cautious how we consider events without recognising therein His Presence.

One protest only it is necessary to make, that the argument is very distinct from that unreal eclectic system, which confounds truth, and degrades our sense of Providence, by looking on the different forms of error only as various modes of educating good under the Divine control. The cases are perfectly distinct, inasmuch as it is one thing, where God has promised to be present for our guidance, "to feel after Him, if haply we may find Him," in order to know what that guidance is; and another to acquiesce in, and reconcile ourselves to, shapes of evil, on the ground that they will ultimately redound to His glory.

2. Such an enquiry particularly necessary at present.

The consideration which is here entered upon appears to be especially necessary at the present crisis; for the more our attention is turned to the ancient Liturgies and usages, the more, I suppose, shall we be convinced that such could have come from no other source than that from which the Holy Scriptures have themselves proceeded. This thought, indeed, is familiar to most of us, from what we have retained. And impressed with this awful sense of the sanctity of the ancient forms of worship, a reverential mind will naturally shrink from the idea of their being remodelled and altered by man. And the discovery that this has been to a certain extent the case in our own Liturgy may have a tendency to impair that (I may say) filial affection and respect which is due to her from whom we have received our Spiritual birth in one Sacrament, and the bread of life in the other. And, indeed, obedience to her, as standing in the nearest of parental relations, is a part of that charity without which even the understanding of mysteries and knowledge avail not. When our thoughts revert to earlier and better times, we shall, of course, be filled with some sad reflections at the melancholy contrast, looking upon the later Church as "the second temple," and in the words of holy Herbert, "deserving tears;" or in the more sacred words in the Prophet Haggai, "Is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing?" But He who spake these

words, and who now alloweth us to see this contrast, added to them, "Yet now be strong, for I am with you, saith the LORD of Hosts. According to the word that I covenanted with you, 'when ye came out of Egypt, so my SPIRIT remaineth among you.' It is on this promised presence of CHRIST, who hath covenanted to abide with His Church, that these observations are founded. With regard to the general principle, of course, the only question can be, whether our Church has done any thing to forfeit those promises. But this, we may confidently trust, is not the case. Strong judicial withdrawals doubtless there may have been, and withholdings of light, as indicating a threatened removal of that candlestick itself, in which the light is placed, if we repent not. But those essentials, to which the promise has been annexed, have not been forfeited, while we retain those Mysteries which are "necessary to salvation;" and Divinely-commissioned stewards to convey them. And with regard to an Apostolic form of Liturgy, the Church in all ages has allowed, that, as long as the substance continues the same, circumstantial varieties are permitted to particular Churches. This, Mr. Palmer maintains, in his "*Origines Liturgicæ*," and Hooker implies the same. "No doubt," says he, "from God it hath proceeded, and by us " it must be acknowledged a work of His singular care and providence, that the Church hath evermore held a prescript form of " common prayer, although not in all things every where the same, " yet for the most part retaining still the same analogy. So that " if the Liturgies of all ancient Churches throughout the world be " compared amongst themselves, it may be easily perceived they " had all one original mould¹." So that in these things we have not forfeited the promise. And surely if the use made of the Septuagint version in the New Testament furnishes us with a Scriptural proof that this translation of the Scriptures was conducted under the control of that Spirit from which those Scriptures themselves proceeded, notwithstanding alterations made in the text, and the persons engaged in that work : in like manner may we regard even the alterations which have taken place in our

¹ B. v. c. 25. 2.

Liturgy. It may be we do not approve of the persons, or of the motives which produced them. It may be that those changes took from us a part of our ancient inheritance ; yet, should we not rather say, with a religious caution, that the same Hand which has mercifully afforded us so much beyond our deserts, has in justice withdrawn such higher privileges for our unworthiness ? And if we show ourselves meet to receive them by a pious use of what remains, then it may be we shall have them more fully restored. Or may they not be withholden in mercy, no less than in justice, as injurious to an age that cannot receive them but to condemnation, according to the words of a Latin hymn,—

“ Quam nos potenter allicia ?
Te, CHRISTE, quando detegis,
Te quando celas, providus
Nobis perque consulis.”

TRANSFIG. DOM. Paris. Brev.

To recur to the reference just made to the Septuagint. If, as St. Augustin maintains¹, the same SPIRIT, which was in the Prophets when they spake, was in the translators of the Septuagint when they interpreted, expressing the same things differently, in the same manner that He does by different Prophets in Scripture, and omitting, or adding, or altering, as best suited the wisdom of His purpose ; so also the omissions and additions and alterations in our own Liturgy, we may reverently trust, were ordered by the same SPIRIT under whose control the first rites of Catholic worship were ordained. For if the presence of CHRIST still continues in His Church, in what circumstances can we conceive His Divine control to be more exerted than in regulating these changes ? For rituals and forms of prayer, however unimportant in human eyes, assume a very high character and value when considered as the appointed means of access from man to God ; as methods of approach to Him, which He has Himself provided, and of which we are bound to make use,—for as individuals we have no choice ;—as moreover objects of sacred asso-

¹ De Civitate Dei, lib. xviii. c. 43.

ciation to which the affections of good men will naturally become attached from use, and the more attached the better they are ; as instruments, however mean in man's estimation, which serve as vehicles through which healing and virtue go forth from CHRIST to restore our soul's maladies ; as moulds of thought and expression to those suits which, in the majestic words of Hooker¹ " the " ALMIGHTY doth there sit to hear, and angels, intermingled as " associates, attend to further."

This consideration will afford a high value and importance to many changes in themselves apparently trivial ; and it must be remembered that the lessons of Divine wisdom are often written in the very smallest characters, and that it is not from single letters or syllables, but from the combination of them, when carefully put together, that those lessons are to be understood. The proof will consist more in an accumulation of a number of little detached accidents, all tending collectively to one great purport or effect, than in any signal revolutions or events. It is necessary therefore to claim a patient attention to each, and assent is only required, if the evidence for the whole appears to bear out the case. Each point may be but slight in itself, yet all these in their connections one with another may be such as to form a perceptible and distinct chain, partially indeed interrupted by clouds from our view, yet such as may be seen to extend far beyond the reach of man's contrivance, so as to show that it can be no other chain than that which is suspended from the throne of God.

3. *The three divisions of the argument.*

These indications of a superintending Providence will be considered in regard to three points into which the subject naturally resolves itself in its various bearings.

The first is, that these changes through a long course of time have one prevailing character, and that so deeply and so gently infused, as to prove no human intention, and so extensive as to imply a design beyond the limited range of man's foresight.

¹ B. v. c. 25. 2.

Secondly, that they are replete with Providential remedies and warnings against those peculiar evils which have since arisen, and are likely to increase in the last days, as Scripture has foretold.

And, thirdly, that changes in the external condition of the Church, and its pervading peculiarities, harmonize with those that are internal, so as to indicate one controlling design and purpose.

In all these cases it will, I think, appear, that though in tracing historically these alterations, external circumstances were not such as we could have wished or approve, yet that notwithstanding there has resided in the Church a Divine life, a power of assimilating, and converting, and turning into nourishment, heterogeneous, and often hurtful substances. And thence it has happened that notwithstanding the worldly influences to which she has been subject, the King's Daughter, though she has passed through the fire, has been in misfortune, and is in captivity, yet, under all changes, is still "glorious within," and "her clothing of wrought gold."

4. That we have given us the language of servants rather than sons.

The first point which I would wish to show is, that through these alterations there runs one prevailing tendency, to put into our mouths the language of servants rather than that of sons. Now, though it may be matter of doubt whether the Reformation was in all respects what the name imports, or whether it were brought about in general by motives of sincere repentance, yet it must be allowed that it was a call to repentance on the part of God, a call to the Church to return to her first love and repent; and that it was on the part of man a profession of repentance. Previously therefore to, and independently of, any proof, it seems not unreasonable to suppose, that as in the case of an individual, so also with the Church at large, He who sees the returning penitent afar off, and hastens to meet him, should also put those

becoming words into his mouth, by which he confesses himself to have forfeited the claim of sonship, and to be willing to be received in a lower state.

5. *The Collects.*

First of all, to turn our attention to the Collects, and the alterations made respecting them. They are indeed not many, but consist either in the entire rejection of the older, and the substitution of a new form, or in the adaptation of another old one, or else in a slight change of expression, in the process of their passing into the English form. When we compare them, as they now stand, with earlier Liturgies, and endeavour to ascertain the causes of the changes, we do not find, I think, that the rejections or alterations of the ancient prayers have taken place merely on account of "the interpolations of things false and "superstitious"¹ as is usually stated to be the case. But one thing I cannot but observe, that, whether designedly or not, these changes seem to have one drift, and bear one way, in the point alluded to, namely this, that entire Collects, or expressions in them, which imply the privileges of the faithful, or spiritual rejoicing, as of sons, are dropped; and prayers substituted in a lower tone.

To take the first Collect in Advent. It is one newly introduced, and though it is mainly remodelled on the language of the Epistle and Gospel, Mr. Palmer gives a Latin prayer which he supposes it to resemble. The difference in the two forms consists in this—we find that in the ancient form there are the words "*who rejoice according to the flesh for the coming of Thine only "begotten Son*"²." These are not in ours, but we have instead the sentence "*in the time of this mortal life in which Thy Son "Jesus Christ came to visit us in great humility.*"

Proceeding to Christmas-day, we find in King Edward's First

¹ See Bishop Mant's Common Prayer, on the Collects.

² "*Qui de Adventu Unigeniti tui secundum carnem lætantur.*"

Book, there was a double service for this festival, and the Collect, which was afterwards omitted, is the following :

"God, which makest us glad with the yearly remembrance of the birth of Thy only Son JESUS CHRIST: Grant that as we joyfully receive Him for our Redeemer, so we may with sure confidence behold Him when He shall come to be our Judge."—

Compare the more subdued prayer for renewal, in the Collect we have for this day, with this one which is now omitted, or with the Collect in the Parisian Breviary, which is thus ¹:

"O God, who hast given the bread of angels to be the food of the faithful in the fold of the Church, grant us, we pray Thee, in this present world, a foretaste of the sweetness of the heavenly joys, that, in that which is to come, Thou mayest lead us to the fulness of everlasting rewards, through the same:—"

The object of Divine wisdom, in these changes, may have been that, as "leaping for joy," and being "exceedingly glad," are commands given only, in Scripture, on occasions of external persecution and distress, such were not suited for the times of worldly prosperity which our Church was to be tempted with beyond others. But I only speak now of the fact.

In like manner take the Sunday after Ascension Day; one cannot but at once inquire, why the former Collect for this day has not been retained? The present Collect I can only find used as an antiphone in the Roman Breviary on this day. The Collect in the Parisian Breviary alludes to the gifts poured on the Apostles, as if still continued in the Church. That selected for our use is, that we be not left "comfortless," "*ne nos derelinquas orphanos.*"

The Collect for St. John the Baptist's day is another instance; in the Sarum Missal and Parisian Breviary, it is ²,

¹ "Deus, qui panem Angelorum in præsepi Ecclesiæ cibum fecisti fidelium, da nobis, quesumus, in præsenti sæculo degustare cœlestium dulcedinem gaudiorum, ut in futuro perducas nos ad satietatem æternorum præmiorum. Per eundem."

² "Deus, qui præsentem diem honorabilem nobis in beati Joannis nativitate fecisti; da populis tuis spiritualium gratiam gaudiorum, et omnium fidelium mentes dirige in viam salutis æternæ; per."

"O GOD, who hast made this present day honourable unto us by
"the nativity of the blessed John, grant unto Thy people the grace
"of spiritual joys; and direct the minds of all the faithful unto
"the way of eternal salvation, through—."

Compare this with our own, of him who was "*sent to prepare
"the way of our SAVIOUR, by preaching of repentance, that we may
"follow his doctrine and life, truly repent, and patiently suffer."*
There is in the Roman Missal another Collect for this day, which
might be quoted, with the former, as bearing on the same point
of view.

For St. Bartholomew's day the Latin form¹ begins thus—

"Almighty and everlasting God, who hast afforded unto us the
"reverend and holy joy of this day in the festival of Thy blessed
"Apostle Bartholomew;" this is altered in ours, but the latter
part is the same, which it may be observed is purely practical.

Add to this, that although we have indeed on Whit-Sunday retained the ancient prayer which speaks of "*rejoicing*" in the comfort of the Spirit, yet even at this season the daily Collects, which speak of the adoption and spiritual joy, find no place in ours. Take for instance the following, which is found on Monday in Whitsun-Week in the Missals² (on Friday in the Parisian Breviary):

¹ "Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui hujus diei venerandam sanctamque
"lætitiam in beati Bartholomæi Apostoli tui festivitate tribuisti," &c.

² As the Sarum and Roman Missal will be often alluded to in this treatise, it may be as well to say something concerning them. Our own Coll. Epist. and Gospel are mostly taken from the Sarum. In addition to which the Sarum has the Introit or Psalm at the commencement; the Graduale, or verses of Scripture chaunted after the Gospel; the Offertorium, or a verse from Scripture after the Epistle and the Creed, and also a Post-Communion Collect. These graduales (as they are termed) are very striking and beautiful in the Sarum Missal; they are called Graduale from being chaunted on the steps of the Pulpit (see Origines Liturgicæ, v. i. p. 308): and followed by Allelujah, except from Septuagesima to Easter, which was also usual after the Gospel. The Roman Missal, though for the most part similar to that of Sarum, has some alterations (e. g. for a great part of the year their Epistle is that which in the Sarum Missal and in our own Prayer Book is found to be that for the preceding week). The Roman is also marked with some apparently Popish innovations; innovations, from which the Sarum is comparatively free: for instance, besides a Collect the same as our own and that of Sarum, they have three more, one respecting the Virgin, another against the persecutors of the Church, and a third for the Pope. A

¹ "O GOD, who hast given unto Thine apostles Thy holy Spirit, grant unto Thy people the effectual obtaining of their petition, that upon those to whom Thou hast given faith, Thou mayest bestow peace also; through—"

The nearest petition which we have to this is perhaps the Collect, "*that what we ask faithfully we may obtain effectually*"; where it is to be observed that the prayer in ours is hypothetical. Several other Collects at this season in the ancient liturgies are of the same, or even higher tone than the one above translated.

This tendency, in our own Prayer Book, to bring out, as it were by accident, the more humble and practical character in these changes, may be observed in the Collect, which we have for the first Sunday after Easter. Until the Review in 1662, the Collect, which occupied this place, was that which is the "Preface" at the Communion for Easter Day, the commencement of which, it may be remembered, is this—

"But chiefly are we bound to praise Thee for the glorious Resurrection of Thy Son JESUS CHRIST,"—and the end "*who by His death hath destroyed death, and by His rising to life again hath restored to us everlasting life.*"—

A form consisting entirely of thanksgiving. Instead of this, we have on this Sunday the modern Collect before used on Easter Tuesday, as we find it in the Scotch Prayer Book, containing the supplication, "*That we may so put away the leaven of malice and wickedness, that we may serve Thee in pureness of living and truth*."²

The Collect for Ash Wednesday again, although Mr. Palmer traces the beginning of it to a Latin one in the Sarum Missal, has for its own those earnest words of penitence, "*create and*

curious instance of what appears unfair dealing may be mentioned, in a beautiful Post Communion Collect for the 2nd Sunday after Advent the Sarum has "*cibo potuque spiritualis alimentis*," the Roman in the same Collect omits the word "*potuque*."

¹ "Deus, qui apostolis tuis sanctum dedisti Spiritum, concede plebi tue piam petitionis effectum; ut quibus dedisti fidem largiaris et pacem; per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, in unitate ejusdem Spiritus sancti, Deus."

² This was the Collect in the second service for Easter Day in Edward's First Book.

"make in us new and contrite hearts, that we, worthy lamenting
 "our sins, and acknowledging our wretchedness, may obtain of
 "Thee, the God of all mercy, perfect remission and forgiveness."

6. Verbal alterations.

Sometimes, indeed, this change in the tone and spirit of our Church is indicated in the mere alteration of a word, as in the dropping of the expression "*fidelium*;" such, for instance, is the following, in the Collect for the 4th Sunday after Easter: the Latin was "*qui fidelium mentes unius efficit voluntatis*." This was at first literally rendered in our own, as we find it in the Scotch Prayer Book, as follows; "*who makest the minds of Thy faithful people to be of one will*." In the Review of the Liturgy in the year 1662, this was altered to "*who alone canst order the unruly wills and affections of sinful men*." Here a prayer for love among faithful sons becomes imperceptibly one for ordering the unruly affections of sinful mankind.

If there is any force in this omission of the word "*fidelium*," there is the same in the frequent incidental adoption of that of "*servant*." In the Collect for the 3d Sunday in Lent the term "*humilium*;" that of "*supplicantium*," in that for the 10th after Trinity; in that of the 5th after Easter "*supplicibus tuis*;" and also in the daily Collect for grace that of "*supplices tuos*," are all rendered "*humble servants*," though the Latin is in other respects for the most part closely translated. In the 13th after Trinity the expression was "*ut ad promissiones tuas sine offensione curamus*." It was literally preserved in the expression, "*that we running to Thy promises may be made partakers of Thy heavenly treasure*;" and in the Scotch, "*that we may so run to Thy heavenly promises that we fail not finally to attain the same*." In 1662 the words were introduced "*that we may so faithfully serve Thee*." And, again, in the Litany, "*O God, merciful Father*," the words "*we Thy servants*," are entirely introduced into the translation in the Collect.

The same tendency may be traced through other changes, at first sight even apparently more trifling, as where in the Collect for Ascension Day the words are inserted "*that we may thither*

"ascend," in the original it is only that we may dwell in mind in heavenly places, "*mente in cœlestibus habitemus.*" It will be seen, that the prayer is, as it were, from a lower station; the ancient form, that we may continue to dwell in those heavenly places to which we have already arrived by baptismal privilege; the later, that we may arise as from an inferior state. In like manner it is curious to observe, that in the Collect for the 20th Sunday after Trinity, the word "*liberis mentibus,*" in both of Edward's books "*with free hearts,*" becomes in the last Review¹, "*cheerfully*;" the idea of freedom is lost, resignation is substituted.

With regard to the word "*servant,*" it may be said that this term is more congenial to our language, or to the sober temper of our nation; but even were it so, (and perhaps similar reasons might be found for explaining the whole effect which is here traced,) yet such remarks only refer to secondary causes, and do not touch the main argument, that there is a Providential purpose to place us in this position. Nor, indeed, can they be attributed to any puritanical influences studiously assuming the tone of humility; but the contrary. Indeed, it is curious to observe, from

¹ On this occasion, and on the previous Sunday, an allusion to the Gospel or Epistle for the day appears lost by the verbal alteration. The word "*free hearts*" seems to have a reference to those worldly hindrances and entanglements which the Gospel speaks of. In the Collect for the 19th Sunday after Trinity the words "*the working of Thy mercy,*" or "*the operation of Thy mercy,*" appear to refer to the miracle narrated in the Gospel for the day; it was altered at the last Review to "*Thy Holy Spirit.*" It might be remarked, in many more of the Collects, that where verbal alterations have taken place in translating them from the Latin for the sake of improving the expression, that the reference to the Gospel (or the Epistle) is not so evident as it was in the original: thus on the 4th Sunday after the Epiphany the allusion to the Gospel is palpable in the Latin. And that this reference is not imaginary is evident from a similar reference on the previous and following Sundays; "*stretch forth Thy right hand, help and defend us*" in the Collect obviously alludes to "*Jesus put forth His hand and touched him*" in the Gospel for that day. On the 5th after Epiphany the word "*muniamur*" more distinctly refers to the "enemy" who sowed the tares, than the word "*defend.*" Sometimes the reference is so much on the surface, that it is necessarily perceived, as "*the leading of a star*" on the Epiphany. On the Sexagesima Sunday there are two Latin forms which appear to refer to the Gospel, which reference is lost in the English.

Hooker, that "abjection of mind," and this very term "servility" is one of the charges which the Puritans brought against the Prayer Book. Alluding to two Collects, the one for the 12th Sunday after Trinity, and the other a prayer after the Offertory, similar to it¹, the words of Cartwright are—"This request carrieth with it still the note of the Popish servile fear, and savoureth not of that confidence and reverent familiarity that the children of GOD have through CHRIST with their Heavenly FATHER." And yet from the instances already adduced in this treatise, it would seem that this "note of servile fear" is one peculiarly our own, as differing from the forms of prayer which we have in common with the Church of Rome².

7. *Commencement of our Liturgy.*

This subject of the Collects must be again resumed to set forth another view which will, also, I think, do much by the way to confirm and establish the present one. Perhaps enough has been said to afford us a clue to the spirit of these changes, a spirit not appearing so much on the surface as to imply purpose in the agents, yet on enquiry so manifesting itself as clearly to indicate a secret tendency one way. With the clue thus furnished let us take up the Prayer Book.

We find on opening it that it commences in a manner perfectly different from any of the liturgical books immediately preceding it, those of Sarum, York, and Hereford, to which we may also add the First Book of Edward the Sixth. All these commence, I believe, with the Lord's Prayer, and from thence proceed to the Creed. Instead of this we have the Sentences, the Exhortation, the Confession, and the Absolution, preceding that Prayer. And all and each of these points, in the place which they hold, are so little analogous to other Liturgies, that they may be considered peculiarly characteristic of our own.

¹ The 12th Collect after Trinity was then a literal translation from the Latin. "*Ut dimittas quæ conscientia metuit, et adjicias quæ oratio non præsumit,*" "giving unto us that, that our prayer dares not presume to ask, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

² See Hooker, b. v. c. xlvii. and note, Keble's edition.

Now, the LORD's Prayer is well known to have been always considered as especially the "Prayer of the faithful," the peculiar inheritance of sons. So much so, that in Primitive Liturgies it is supposed not to have been used openly, as their assemblies were resorted to by the Catechumens and others unbaptized, who, not having received the adoption, could not of course approach GOD as a FATHER¹. It is thought that their prayers usually began with a Psalm. This objection to the public use of the LORD's prayer was of course done away with, when the world became Christian. And it afterwards occupied the first place in the Breviaries. The position therefore that it holds with us speaks an emphatic language, as connected with the portions of the service which precede it, which are calculated to serve, as it were, for spiritual ablutions, preparatory to our being allowed to approach GOD with that filial prayer.

Each of the preceding parts of our worship is of this character. First of all, the Sentences. Fault is found with them for this very peculiarity; it is said that they go back to the Law, rather than abound in the privileges of the Gospel. They are calls to Repentance, or deep professions of Repentance throughout; three of them are from the most penitential of the Psalms (the 51st). And in fact they not only adopt the language of the Law and of the Baptist, the Preacher of Repentance, but the very words of the returning prodigal: "*I will arise, and go to my Father, and will say unto Him, Father, I have sinned against Heaven and before Thee, and am no more worthy to be called Thy Son,*" and proceed in the same profession of humiliation, "*Enter not into judgment with Thy servant, O LORD.*"

This character (which also pervades the sentences in the Scotch Prayer Book, though they are themselves different) will appear more strongly by looking at the American Prayer Book. Though the members of that Church have adopted our prefatory sentences, yet they have prefixed three additional ones of their own, which seem quite to lose sight of this bearing on the Confession,

¹ In Edward's first Book, where the LORD's prayer preceded the Communion, it was introduced by the expression, that using it according to CHRIST's command, "*we are bold to say.*"

and are of another tone ; the first of these is, " the LORD is in
 " His holy temple : let all the earth keep silence before Him ¹." The next from Mal. i. 11, " From the rising of the sun even
 " unto the going down of the same, My name shall be great among
 " the Gentiles ; and in every place incense shall be offered unto
 " My name and a pure offering : for My name shall be great among
 " the Heathen, saith the LORD of Hosts ;" and the third, " Let the
 " words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be alway
 " acceptable in Thy sight, O LORD, my strength and my Re-
 " deemer ²."

Now these texts of Scripture in our Prayer Book are followed by the Exhortation, which, it is needless to observe, is of the same character, viz. that of a call to repentance. Indeed, how much exhortation and such appeals indicate a low and decayed state, as the natural remedies for it, will appear from the great tendency to Sermons since the Reformation. At the same time it should be observed, in the words ³ of one whose sentiments are ever to be remembered with affectionate esteem, that such passionate appeals to the feelings, as these often are, would not be so objectionable in themselves, if they were given outside the Church, and not allowed to occupy the place of Religious Worship.

We then come to the Confession. It is needless to show how deeply it is pervaded with this penitential tone. It appears new in itself, and also new in this place in the service, in which it is not supported by much authority in antiquity, excepting perhaps a passage referred to by Bishop Sparrow, and other ⁴ ritualists, from St. Basil, professing it to be their custom to begin with Confession. May we not trust that these strong words of preparatory humiliation are put into our mouths by Him who spake the same language in His Church of old, under circumstances not dissimilar to our own ? For it may be observed, that in the time of the captivity, and in the return from it, the prayers of Daniel, of Ezra, and of Nehemiah, in behalf of their people, begin with a Confession, the very words of which might be put into our mouths at the Reformation. And these Prayers of humiliation

¹ Hab. ii. 20.

² Ps. xix. 14.

³ The late Mr. Froude.

⁴ See Mr. Palmer, vol. i. p. 213. *Antiquities of the English Ritual.*

may be contrasted with that of Solomon, which commences with blessing and thanksgiving.

But there is still something wanting before we are allowed to approach God with the Christian's Prayer, and to use the language of the spirit of adoption; and this is the Absolution. A more merciful provision, than that it should have been preserved and occupied this place, can scarce be conceived.

Such a commencement therefore may prove the characteristic of our Church, as expressive of the position in which God has placed us. It might be said that these introductory parts were insertions in the 2nd Book of Edward, by the intervention of foreigners, who, having shorn and left us bare of so much that is holy and valuable, have necessarily put us into a degraded condition. But it must be remembered, that our object is to divest ourselves of the consideration of secondary agents; to drop all consideration of individuals, as such, is the peculiar privilege and duty of all true members of the Catholic Church. Such deprivations were doubtless judicial; but it may be shown hereafter, how overruling mercies blend with those judgments, frustrating the designs of men; and our purpose is to trace indications of our peculiar dispensation beyond the influences or intention of any set of persons.

8. *The general tone and spirit of our Prayer Book.*

The next point which may be observed, as showing the difference which pervades our own Prayer Book, is a certain spirit, which characterizes the whole tenor of it. We cannot look into Breviaries and Missals without observing their high choral tone in distinction from our own. To advert to particulars; we have the ancient *Κύριε ἐλέησον*, but have not the Hallelujahs; which indeed, in the solemn accents of the ancient Hebrew form, are so frequent in other Churches, that they remind one of the high evangelical promises alluded to in the Apocrypha, "The streets of Jerusalem shall be paved with beryl,—and all her streets shall say Allelujah¹." The Introitus, or Psalm introducing

¹ Tobit xlii. 12.

the Communion, we have lost. The Hosannah, at the end of the Trisagion, the Gloria Deo at the Gospel (excepting as observed by traditionary use), are omitted. In king Edward's first book were the words in the Communion, "*Let us keep a joyful and holy Feast with the Lord ;*" these find no place in ours¹. But we have a penitential responsory on having broken each of the Commandments, and a peculiar prayer of humiliation as unworthy "*to gather up the crumbs under the table.*" We have indeed the Gloria in excelsis, but removed to the Post-Communion, and usually said kneeling. Add to this, that we are even to this day without Canonical Hymns, notwithstanding all efforts to obtain them ; but instead of Psalms² and Spiritual Songs, even our Thanksgiving assumes the shape, and soon falls into the language of Prayer : like them of old in a condition in some degree analogous to our own, "we sit down and weep, when we remember "thee, O Sion ; as for our harps, we hang them up upon the trees "that are therein." Of the few hymns which we have at the end of the version of the Psalms, one is "the humble suit of a sinner," and two are "the lamentations of a sinner." With such a beautiful and touching adaptation to our position does the silence and the language of our Liturgy seem to conspire, all brought about by the influence of that unseen Hand, that changes night into day and summer into winter, by an imperceptible process that

¹ The Service for Easter Day in Edward the VIth's first Book commenced with a high and triumphant anthem, appointed to be used "*afore matins,*" with repeated Hallelujahs. This anthem is indeed retained on that day, but instead of ushering in the Service, it is used for the 95th Psalm, and has two verses prefixed to it, as they now stand in the nature of warning, viz., of keeping the Feast "*with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.*"

² With regard to the daily appointed Psalms, is it not the case that the quantity of Psalms read in our own Church is less than that in any other, the quantity of the other parts of Holy Scripture (*i. e.* for doctrine and admonition), which are read continuously, more than in any other ? The entire Psalter in the Roman and Parisian Breviaries is read through in a week ; in our own it serves for a month. It is also curious to observe, that in the Breviaries the Lectios from Scripture and the Fathers occur in the Nocturns or Night services ; the Hymns in those for the Day. For night may of course be considered, when compared with the day, as the house (or season) of Mourning.

none can mark. The roll put into our hand has lamentation written on it. "Praise," says the Son of Sirach, "is not seemly in "the mouth of a sinner, for it was not sent him of the LORD¹."

Again, from the Prayer "for the Church militant," we have excluded the more solemn commendation to God, and prayer for the Dead; this is a moving thought, for may we not venture to consider it in this light, that we are by this exclusion, as it were, in some degree disunited from the purer communion of those departed Saints who are now with CHRIST, as if scarce worthy to profess ourselves one with them? For the dead who are the objects of prayer are such as are considered in a state of comparative if not complete blessedness; to pray for such in any condition, and for their perfection, is the privilege of saints rather than the office of servants. And in the Prayer of Oblation, the beautiful mention of Angelic ministries, as bearing our supplications into the presence of the Divine Majesty, is lost: as if thereby (to follow the former train of reflection) we were not to be considered meet to be of that sacred society, who are "come to the Mount "Sion," to "the innumerable company of angels," any more than to that of "the spirits of just men made perfect²." But instead of these—the higher and more inspiring commemoration of the spirits of the blessed, and the mention of good angels,—we have introduced into our offices an awful service of "Commination" to the living; and in it an appeal, combining the most fearful denunciations to be found in Scripture, forming an office peculiar to ourselves³.

Moreover, other churches have had their Litanies in times of public calamity⁴, when "God's wrath lies hard upon them;"

¹ Eccles. xv. 9.

² And yet the silence, or rather the slight and touching mention of these subjects, is perhaps the most becoming expression of humiliation that could be made after the great abuse of such prayers.

³ In the first Book of Edward this service was appointed for Ash Wednesday, in the second it is added in the Rubric "to be used divers times in the year;" this Rubric, and that which now stands, produce no practical difference, yet tend more to diffuse the spirit of it into the Church, as a characteristic.

⁴ "These Litanies were at first composed by the Fathers in the primitive "Church, solemnly to be used for *the appeasing of God's wrath in public evils.*"

but to us our own is given as our weekly, nay our almost daily food. And not only so, but it has come to be that of our Sundays also; for it is remarkable, that it was first appointed only for the Wednesday and Friday. How much this contributes to the tendencies alluded to is very evident, in that it infuses so strongly penitential a tone into the Sunday itself. But no intention of this kind is attributed to those who introduced it, but only that of a more solemn service ¹. And the Litany itself, if it differs from former supplications of the kind, it is in this, that it appears to be a combination of every most moving petition, and a deprecation of every evil of body and mind to which guilty sinners are subject, and penitent sinners are brought to the sense of. This peculiar ἡθός of our own Church will be seen by a reference to the American. For the most part adhering to our own Prayer Book (excepting in the Communion Service, which is more primitive,) it will sometimes, by the mere influence of its own inherent difference of spirit, or led by the tendencies of later times, as it were inconsiderately, start aside from its parent's hand. We find, by a slight direction inserted before the *Κόρη ἐλέησον*, that the most solemn and penitential part of the Litany from thence to the prayer, "*We humbly beseech Thee*," may be omitted at the discretion of the minister.

Another trifling circumstance may be noticed. Every body

And further on, "they were afterwards augmented by Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome, in whose time there was much affliction and trouble throughout the world." Hooker, quoted by Bishop Cosins on the Litany.

¹ How expressive of this change in our condition is our custom of kneeling on Sunday instead of standing, as the ancient Church used to do on that day, and through the baptismal season from Easter to Pentecost. This custom we have left off with the white baptismal robes. Add to which, the remarkable tendency in this country to hold Sunday in something of the spirit of a Fast. It might be supposed, indeed, that this is owing to the neglect of the weekly Fast, for if religion is only solemnly thought of on one day in the week, that day must be a day of mourning; and they who are not buried with CHRIST in His death, He raises not to the joy of His resurrection. But even this is not sufficient to account for it. Is it not the case in Germany, that Sunday is a day of festal rejoicing, though they keep no day of humiliation? These remarks on the Sunday are the more important, as it is the Sunday which gives the tone and character to our religion.

must have observed, how much the short prayer to be used after the occasional prayers, which speaks of our "*being tied and bound by the chain of our sins*," is of this penitential character. But observe, how it has crept, as it were, imperceptibly into its present position. It was first only to be used after the prayer in *public sickness*, on an occasion, that is, of public humiliation; but now it almost occupies a place in the general service, as coming after the Prayers in the Ember weeks and others.

9. The Sunday Lessons.

The next point which comes before us is that of the Sunday Lessons, and on this subject it will be sufficient to adduce the testimony of the "Tract for the Times" (No. 13). In this the writer considers that there is a general principle, if not intended yet at all events evidenced by the selection, as running through it, and a key to which may be found in the 95th Psalm. It is curious to find that the American Prayer Book actually omits the latter part of this Psalm, which the writer considers as so expressive in implying this lesson. This general principle alluded to he shows to be one of *admonition*, by setting before us the conduct of God's people of old, and God's dealings with them: "that amidst the daily experience we have of Christians behaving so very differently from what one should expect à *priori* in God's elect, unworthy Christians might discern themselves, by anticipation, in the faithless demeanour of the "Jews." Now, what is this but to remind us that we, like the Jews, have fallen back from our privileges, and that if we do not take heed we shall forfeit the final inheritance also? For it may be observed, that it is the analogy of the Jewish nation which arrests our attention to the fact, and explains to us the later appearances of Christianity as states of degradation.

And may not the compression of the seven canonical Hours into our two daily services be considered also of this character? The Psalmist, indeed, though a Jew, in the state of a servant, yet speaking in the Spirit, anticipates the privileges and language of a son, when he says, "Seven times a day do I praise Thee;"

but we, as if having lost the glad spirit of adoption, which such frequent worship would imply, have come to nothing more than the morning and evening sacrifice of the Jew. Or, if the Litany be considered as a distinct service, to the three times a day of the Jews' public prayers observed by Daniel and David. By the which change, that which had more the character of a spontaneous and free offering, as of the son who was "*always with*" his Father, becomes more like the forced returns of a servant, and an appointed task¹.

10. *Changes in the Rubric.*

To pass from the matter of our Services themselves, there is a circumstance in the Rubric which will serve as a Comment on these changes in the Prayers.

In the time of Edward the Sixth, and sanctioned by his First Book, it seems to have been the custom for the Prayers to be said by the priest in the chancel, turning to the East. Although this was discontinued in the Second Book (where the Rubric spoke of the place where the people could best hear), during the

¹ In the daily prayers there are two peculiarities of our own Church, the one is the position which the prayer for the King occupies before that for the Church; we cannot, humanly speaking, approve of such an anomaly. But may we not perceive in it some design of warning or otherwise? Is it a witness to ourselves of that leaven which has pervaded the Church, and the evil consequences of which we are experiencing, in an Erastian preference of the State to the Church, a badge of the servitude which we have taken on ourselves for want of confidence in God, and looking to the temporal power? Or is it not, on the other hand, a warning against that disobedience to authority which has so much infected this nation, and the first indication of the temper of disobedience to God, and therefore set first as the foundation of natural piety? The next circumstance is the Prayer for the Parliament, which is, of course, unprecedented. It is remarkable that, at the time of its being first issued, and ever since, the Parliament has been more or less the enemy of God's Church, and exercising an indirect control over it. And yet to pray for them, under such circumstances, is of Divine command, and perhaps the strictest parallel to it will be found in the case of the Israelites (Jer. xxix. 7), "Seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be "carried away captives, and pray unto the LORD for it; for in the peace thereof "shall ye have peace." This may be applied to both circumstances alluded to.

year and a half of its duration, it seems to have been partially restored by that of Elizabeth, which prescribes "the accustomed place of the church, chapel, or chancel," which accustomed place cannot, one would think, allude to that of King Edward's Second Book, as a year and a half before the intervening reign of Mary could not of course then be the accustomed place¹. But to this it was added, "except it be otherwise appointed by the Ordinary." Whatever the Rubric may have originally intended, the Morning and Evening Prayer seems gradually to have passed from the chancel to the outer church. In Bishop Sparrow's "Rationale," and a note there quoted of Bishop Andrews, the middle of the church is spoken of as the place for the Litany. Whatever may have occasioned it, the fact itself may serve as a practical illustration of what has been said on the substance of the prayers. That we seem thereby gently thrust as it were aside, and put off from a nearer approach to the Altar, bid to stand off awhile, and take the lower place, the position of suppliants, at the entrance of the chancel, and to "weep between the porch and the altar."

It may be noticed that this proceeding typifies, as it were, by external act, another circumstance of our spiritual condition. The mystical interpretations of Holy Scripture are spoken of by the Fathers as the peculiar privilege of sons, as the inner temple of sacred writ, the holier place. In the Breviaries, such spiritual and deep meanings are much brought before us by the verses which are made to answer each other in the responses, and in the lessons from the Fathers. But by our own church they seem scarcely at all openly taught or recognised; perhaps the most remarkable instance of it may be found in the penitential confessions attached to the reading of each of the commandments as broken, which, of course, must apply to the interior sense as explained by the Catechism: and indeed in the Rubric in the

¹ It is mentioned by Bishop Burnet, that among six Articles discussed by the House of Commons, in the reign of Elizabeth, against the established usages, the first was against Saints' days, the second against turning to the east, the third against the use of the Cross at baptism. These three were therefore at that time considered in the same light. Burnet's Hist. Ref. part iii. book vi.

Scotch Prayer Book, it is said distinctly "according to the mystical interpretation." In both of these cases we are set afar off, but yet allowed to draw near, not prohibited from doing so; and indeed it is to be observed that in almost all the subjects that this view embraces, we are not actually excluded from the higher privileges, so much as that they are quietly withdrawn from our sight. And it may be perceived that, through them all, though we have put into our mouths the expressions of servants, yet the language of mercy is ever breaking forth, which, though we come as servants, is ready to receive us as sons. "Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child? for after I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still."

In speaking of the Rubric, the substitution of the term "*Table*," "*Holy Table*," and in the Scotch of "*God's Board*," for that of "*Altar*," which is in Edward's First Book (as well as "*God's Beard*,") is a strong instance of this our judicial humiliation. For what is it but to say that the higher mysteries which this word "*Altar*," represents are,—not taken away from us (*μὴ γένοιτο*),—but partially withdrawn from view; and doubtless, therefore, lost to many who "consider not the Lord's body." To the participation, indeed, which the word "*Table*" implies, all are admitted; but the oblation which the term "*Altar*" indicates is more removed. Thus they are received at "*God's board*" indeed, but not made so sensible of the presence of Him who admits them as His guests; and therefore, as the Jews of old, receive not equally the benefits of His presence. Such a loss is, therefore, doubtless a great one, which withholds the Altar from our due acknowledgment: but who reads not in this the visitation upon children's children of the sacrilegious pollution it has undergone in this country! But still, as observed before, mercy is mixed with judgment, and the case so stands with us that it says, "He that can receive it, let him receive it." A great privilege, when it is considered that by the last Review, and the insertion of the word "*oblations*," we have that which prophets and kings have desired to see, what King Charles the First and Bishop Andrews had not. And perhaps what was made the subject of Bishop Andrews' prayer, when for the Church of

England his supplication was that "its deficiencies should be restored". And with regard to the Oblation itself, is not the case significative of our position? for it is not that no Oblation is made, for we pray that "our oblations" may be accepted, but that *the oblation is made in silence*. Is not this silence expressive? May it not be considered eloquently significative, more than any words, of our condition, that the higher part of the service, which looks more like the privilege of sons, is performed in humiliation and silence? In the First Book, when the elements were placed on the Altar, the priest was to say the lauds and anthem.

11. *Omission of anointing at Baptism and Confirmation.*

There is another circumstance now to be observed, of more importance than any which have been hitherto considered, the entire omission of the use of oil at baptism and confirmation. The practice on both of these occasions appears to have been primitive, universal, and, possibly, apostolical. In the First Book of Edward, it was appointed that the white vesture or chrism should be put on the child baptized with these words:

"Take this white vesture as a token of the innocency, which by God's grace in this holy sacrament of baptism is given unto Thee."

¹ See Bishop Andrews' Devotions. For the second day. Intercession.

"In behalf of the Catholic Church,

For her establishment and increase.

"In behalf of the Eastern,

For her freedom and union.

"In behalf of the Western,

For her restoration and peace.

"In behalf of the British,

*That her deficiencies may be supplied,
And that what remains in her may be confirmed.*

Βρετανικῆς,

*ἐπιδιορθώσεως λαϊκόντων
ἐπιστηριξεως λοιπῶν* } *ἐν αὐτῇ.*

² In the Sarum Missal we find prayers said in secret on the Oblation. In the Roman Missal the Rubric says "oblacione facta dicuntur orationes secretæ."

After the above the priest was to anoint the head of the infant, saying—

“Almighty GOD, the FATHER of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, who hath regenerated Thee by water, and the HOLY GHOST, and hath given unto thee remission of all thy sins. He vouchsafe to anoint thee with the unction of His HOLY SPIRIT, and bring thee to the inheritance of everlasting life¹.”

It is probable that this anointing after Baptism was considered as preparatory to Confirmation, so as to supply the place of that anointing. And in the service for Confirmation there was a prayer that seemed to allude to this external anointing, in which it is said, “Confirm and strengthen them with the inward unction of the HOLY GHOST mercifully unto everlasting life². Amen.”

Now it does not appear that even Bucer himself attempted to deny the ancient authority of this practice, though indeed he appears to have had but little real reverence for antiquity, but the ground for his having this practice rejected is, “because he thought they (*i. e.* the chrism and anointing,) carried more show of regard and reverence to the mysteries of our religion than men really retained.”

Now, if it be allowed that there is the strongest Church authority for the use of this significative emblem³, and also that in Christianity there is no such thing as a merely external and significative rite without being in some degree sacramental also; if it be also the case, that if a custom is found to be primitive, it can hardly be conceived, with any deference to the piety of those ages, but that it must have been apostolical: if we consider, moreover, the little likelihood that Apostles would have invented any thing of a sacramental nature of themselves; if, moreover,

¹ See Wheatley, page 382.

² Wheatley, p. 344.

³ Among the Records at the end of Collier's Ecclesiastical History, are given the answers of the Bishops and Divines at the Reformation to the questions put them, on this point of confirmation “cum Chrismate.” These are curious and well worth consulting. Many of them confirm the traditionary authority of anointing, though it was not immediately the point referred to, the question being whether it be found in Scripture. Nor indeed do any appear to deny the antiquity of the usage.

we call to mind the typical signification of oil in Scripture, so exceedingly high and holy, and the occasions of its use, viz. in separating from others the most elevated stations which prefigured the Messiah; in its typical use applied (not as baptism administered to conforming heathens, but) to Prophets, Priests, and Kings of the sacred people.—When we consider these things, surely no one can say the greatness of the gifts which are here withdrawn; how much we have thereby fallen from the high appellations of “a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people:” and we have together with it lost the white robe of baptism. The essentials, indeed, are not touched, but they are things of this kind which we have lost. The lessons of humiliation, of being “buried and crucified with CHRIST,” it may be shown hereafter we have still retained. We may still act up to our lower dispensation, and have privileges restored on our repentance; but we cannot expect or wish it, I think, without. “He that now goeth on his way weeping, and beareth good seed, shall doubtless *come again with joy*, and bear his sheaves with him.”

12. *Changes in the Visitation of the Sick.*

There are three Omissions in the office for “the Visitation of the Sick” since Edward’s First Book, which seem to me capable of the same construction as illustrative of the last subject; and perhaps not more so in themselves than in the reasons by which their disuse is generally supported by our English Ritualists. The first is the practice of Anointing the sick, if he required it. There is, I believe, no mention of this custom during the first centuries. But the ground on which its disuse is generally maintained is, that it applied, as mentioned by St. James, to miraculous cures, and therefore is not suitable to our days. Here therefore a broad line of distinction is drawn, between miraculous cures, and those to be now expected, as if we were not in a state to receive what our forefathers did. Can this be warranted, except on the supposition that the faith required must be of this lower and ordinary kind? That the “grain of mustard seed,” which is now borne by the tree whose branches fill the earth, is not of the

quality of the first seed, which had the promise that it should "remove mountains." The next is a trivial omission, but of the same character. In the first of Edward there was this prayer for the sick :

"Visit him, O LORD, as Thou didst Peter's wife's mother, and the captain's servant ; and as Thou didst preserve Toby and Sarah by Thine angel from danger, so restore unto this sick person his former health, if it be Thy will." The rejection of this prayer, it is worthy of observation, is usually approved of for the same reasons, that it refers to miraculous cures not to be now expected.

The other alteration is one apparently still more slight, but not unimportant as bearing on this principle ; in the last Review, (in the year 1662), the four last verses of the 71st Psalm, which is used in "the Visitation," are omitted. The grounds of this alteration are, that the psalm then turns to one of thanksgiving, beginning with these expressions—"O what great troubles and adversities hast Thou shewed me ! and yet didst Thou turn and refresh me ; yea, and broughtest me from the deep of the earth again. Thou hast brought me to great honor." But it is observable, that most of the Psalms written under the pressure of affliction do thus turn from deprecation to thanksgiving. And what is this slight omission ? Surely it may be considered as a silent and undesigned expression of misgiving respecting the existence of that faith required for the promise to prayer. For the promise is not future only, but present,—"*Whatever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them.*" (St. Mark xi. 24.) Another alteration is, that this office did begin with a Psalm, the 143d, but now with a Litany. We allow that these are not important changes in themselves, but it is not unimportant to notice that, wherever we find changes, they should speak to the same effect.

13. Concluding Remarks.

In all these things we have no reason surely to complain of the judicial withholdings of privileges, but to lament our unfitness to receive them ; the fact is, our "iniquities have separated between

"us and our God." "Our sins have withholden good things from us." The essentials of a Church we have by many merciful interpositions still preserved to us; they are only matters denoting the highest privileges, royal gifts, that are withdrawn: the two Sacraments are retained on the very ground of their being essentially "*necessary to salvation*;" we have the Body and Blood of CHRIST, "*the strengthening and refreshing of our souls*;" we have "bread to strengthen man's heart," "and wine that maketh glad the heart of man," but have not the "oil to make him a cheerful countenance¹," such outward demonstration of joy being for faithful sons, for "the royal priesthood," and not for such as we.

If we may judge at all from the ALMIGHTY's former dispensations with mankind, may we not suppose that this may be the case in the scheme (to speak reverently,) of redemption, viz. that as with individuals, so also with Churches, there are different degrees of grace according to the use of former gifts, as there are different mansions of glory hereafter? Though doubtless in the last and lowest dispensation, it may be true of individuals that the last may be first, and the first (*i. e.* in privileges), the last (*i. e.* in final acceptance).

I cannot better explain these various positions in which Churches stand with regard to the Divine gifts, than by adopting for illustration an expression of Origen's respecting individuals. He seems to imagine, that each person has a guardian Angel assigned to him, but that if he shows himself unworthy of his heavenly guide, he is consigned to the care of an inferior Angel; but that on the contrary, if found worthy, he has a still higher and better guide given to be with him; and that this continues to be the case through life. This may illustrate what I mean by the case of Churches. No one can doubt but that we have been, if we are not now, on the very point of being committed as a Church, to an Angel, so to say, of far less and lower privileges. For what was said by Bucer of the use of anointing, might almost be applied now to the two Sacraments, viz. that though

¹ "The oil of gladness," Ps. xlv. 8; Heb. i. 9.

he doubted not the Catholic practice, nor the edification if received with reverence, yet such reverence to receive them as conveying great spiritual gifts was lost. To our own Church, therefore, in the mysterious fulness of Divine truth, the warning may be given, which was said to Israel of old :

“ Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way,
“and to bring thee to the place which I have prepared. Beware
“of Him, and obey His voice ; provoke Him not : for he
“will not pardon your transgressions, for My name is in Him.”
(Exod. xxiii. 20, 21.)

PART II.

LESSONS OF OBEDIENCE INTRODUCED INTO OUR LITURGY.

1. *Recapitulation of the general point of view in which the subject is treated.*

BEFORE again entering upon the particular consideration of this subject, it will be expedient to keep in mind the point of view in which it has been our object to look upon the whole of the question. It must be remembered that nothing is said in approbation, or in censure, of these alterations. Some might be disposed to think that the changes in the second Book of King Edward, brought about through the advice and influence (though, perhaps, not the open instrumentality) of foreigners, were opposed to the spirit of the previous declaration intended against Rome, that each Church was to regulate its own internal affairs; that it had not so much the free and spontaneous concurrence of the Church itself; and that therefore this Book had not the high sanction of the former. Or it might be supposed that any innovation at all on the ancient forms of worship savoured of irreverence, for it is written, "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set," and that it therefore endangered the Church's forfeiting the blessing attached to the fifth commandment, which promises the strength of earthly inheritance to honour paid to parents; for it is a kind of parental authority which sacred antiquity claims over us. It is an easy matter now to think thus; but, considering the state of the times, it should rather be ever remembered as the interference of a most merciful Providence that any thing ancient was retained through those convulsions. The reverence for antiquity which guided our alterations was the admiration of foreigners. This Grotius remarks in terms of praise; and Casaubon¹: and Bucer himself could not but approve

¹ "In Angliâ vides quam bene processerit dogmatum noxiorum repurgatio; hæc maxime de causâ, quod qui¹ d sanctissimum negotium procurandum susceperê,
VOL. V.—86.

the first Book as agreeable to primitive usage as well as to Scripture¹. Add to which, the corrupt innovations which had been inserted into the ancient worship, rendered some change not only excusable but necessary, and occasioned at that period a great difficulty in ascertaining what was clearly Catholic. There was not, as abroad, the hand of Uzza; not unauthorized instruments raised to support the ark of God; but it was ever, as it moved from place to place, in the keeping of the Priest and the Levite. If therefore the work were necessary, and if in the fabrication of the material tabernacle, in which the ALMIGHTY was pleased to dwell, He called the workmen "by name," and "filled them with

"nihil admiserint novi, nihil sui; sed ad meliora secula intentam habuere oculorum aciem." Grotii Epist. ad Joan. Corvinum.

"Si me conjectura non fallit, totius Reformationis pars integerrima est in Angliâ; ubi, cum studio veritatis, viget studium antiquitatis: quam certi homines dum spernunt, in laqueos se inducent, unde, nisi mendacio, exuere se nequeunt." Isaac Casaubon. Ep. Claud. Salmasio, quoted by Bishop Jebb, Practical Theology, p. 37.

¹ The first committee of Bishops and Divines in the first year of King Edward VI. was appointed to compose "an uniform mode of Communion according to the rules of Scripture, and the use of the Primitive Church." And the commission at the Savoy conference in the time of King Charles II. was "to compare the Common Prayer Book with the most ancient Liturgies that had been used in the Church, in the most primitive and purest times." So that from first to last our Church has sanctioned no other rule of guidance but that of Scripture and Catholic antiquity combined; and our altars have not been made, to use an expression of Bishop Taylor, "of unhallowed turf." And that up to that period the forms and modes of worship were of a traditionary nature, appears from their very names, as "The Salisbury Use, the Hereford Use, the Use of Bangor," &c. and that the people were familiar with them is indicated by an apology in the Preface to Edward's Book for the necessity of their reading "upon the book, whereas before, by the reason of so often repetition, they could say many things by heart." And that previous to the formation of these Liturgies, Divine Worship was regulated by traditionary use appears from this, that Gregory (A.D. 500) whose Sacramentary seems to have been the foundation of them, thinks it necessary to apologize for making some alterations and additions to the Collects, for which he pleads the sanction of a custom in the Greek Church. To which it may be added, that Mr. Palmer traces some of the Collects beyond that of Gregory to the Sacramentary of Gelasius, 494 A.D.; and to that of Leo, still more ancient. Nor is at all apparent that St. Jerome, to whom the selection of the Epistles and Gospels is attributed, acted himself without this restraint of tra-

"wisdom and understanding" for the work, surely we ought not to doubt but that in this most sacred undertaking a Divine control and superintendence was not forfeited. It was surely the part of a pious Israelite to hold in honour each part of that material work, though he knew not the significative emblems and deep meanings which it contained; and as succeeding ages more and more opened and revealed them, to enquire into each particular with reverence. While he saw on the retrospect indications of Divine Wisdom, in what he had before ignorantly but religiously revered, in pious adoration of the mysterious workmanship, he thought not of the name of Bezaleel, the son of Uri, though of the more favoured tribe of Judah, and Aholiab, the son of Ahisamach, though of the less honoured tribe of Dan (Exod. xxxi.) who formed it. Surely with feelings akin to this, we may retrace the particulars of our own mould of worship, knowing not how much of heavenly import and providential admonition may secretly be hid, not only in the candlestick and the table, but even in the rings and the staves, (Exod. xxxviii.) the varied fringes of the garment and the blue ribbands.

2. Duty of considering these changes as a Divine work.

There are passages in the Gospels which we cannot fail to remark as intended beforehand against certain evils which should afterwards prevail. We cannot, for instance, but discern in the frequent repetition throughout the 14th and 15th chapters of St. John, of expressions respecting the "keeping of the commandments," as the only sign of Love, a prophetic warning against the evils of fanaticism; and a no less distinct denunciation anticipating the errors of Popery on more than one occasion; first, in our Lord's words respecting His holy mother; and, secondly, in those words, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing," which seem to provide against harsh definitions of His mysterious presence in the Eucharist, concerning which he had been speaking throughout that chapter. (St. John vi.) To which may be also added, the remarkable insertion of the word "*all*," in the delivery of the cup, "Drink ye *all* of this." (St. Matt. xxvi. 27.) If this be the case, as it is natural to suppose, may we not conclude that in some degree also His control-

ling agency may have inserted prophetic cautions in the teaching of a particular Church against those peculiar evils which should afterwards assail it? Does not the very promise of our SAVIOUR's unfailing Presence in His Church against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail, lead a meek and obedient spirit to feel after such guidance, and to rest assured that such a meek obedience to CHRIST's Church would somehow or other afford him refuge and safety? "The LORD is a tower of strength; the righteous run into it and are safe." For it is through matters of this nature that a spirit of affectionate submission speaks among the generality of Christians; not through enquiry and investigation into the principles and intentions of the Church, so much as by imbibing day by day its devotional and practical character; not so much by a definite act of acknowledged obedience, and a reflex consideration of that act, as by a tacit and almost unconscious participation of its spirit. If security is to be found in the Church, it must be in great measure by means of these indirect channels. If the Church be the robe of Christ, woven throughout without seam, he who prizes, and cherishes as full of virtue, even the hem of His garment, though accused by the world of superstition, (as we must be when we make forms of so much importance,) yet shall he derive thereby the full benefit of his piety. Yea, though such be but touching the hem of CHRIST's garment in the spirit of charity, yet shall he partake even in these days, of that anointing, which came of old on the Head of the Church, and went down to the skirts of His clothing.

It is necessary to call our attention again and again to considerations of this kind, as the proof necessarily depends so much on words, and sentences, and short prayers, which, humanly speaking, might not appear worthy of that importance which this argument attaches to them; and the combination of which, as a whole, contains so valuable a principle.

The difficulty of obtaining a fair hearing for this mode of enquiry, arises from the temptation we are under of allowing our thoughts to turn to the secondary causes. But surely, whatever the agents were, it is right to consider them merely as instruments in the hands of God, raised up for some particular design relating to His Church. For instance, that one of the Gospels

should abound very peculiarly with consolations to the Penitent, and that that Gospel should have been intended especially for the Gentiles, indicates a merciful purpose of God. Nor is the force of that indication lessened, when we find that it was "the beloved Physician" who selected these lessons of comfort, as perhaps most congenial to his own temper of mercy? or that, when the world had been prepared for it, and rising heresies required it, another Gospel should have come forth replete with the higher mysteries of Wisdom and Charity, is the purpose of God to be less admired therein, because it was "the beloved Disciple" who wrote that Gospel, and who, in doing so, was but following the bent of a holy frame of mind, which is ever dwelling upon heavenly things? And now, though it is not by the instrumentality of miracles, or a miraculous voice, that we receive the intimations of the Divine agency, yet they are not, in themselves, the less certain. The hand that bears it may appear human, but the lesson of humiliation which it bears is divine: "When I looked, behold, an hand was sent unto me; and, lo, a roll of a book was therein. And it was written within and without; and there was written therein lamentations, and mourning, and woe." (Ezek. ii.)

3. Warnings introduced against the "lawlessness" of the last days.

Having said thus much on the general nature of the subject, we may again return to the particular enquiry. The second train of thought, suggested by a review of these changes in our Liturgy, is singularly coincident with, and in itself no less remarkable than the former. It is this; that there is providentially introduced, and inserted throughout, in some shape or other, the mention of obedience.

This is, I say, remarkable, and that in two points of view. First, because it perfectly agrees with, and confirms, the former argument, inasmuch as it is in accordance with reason and Scripture, that if the ALMIGHTY is pleased to put into our minds the language of penitence, He should accompany this also with calls to obedience, as the test of that repentance. Such is the general argument. And in the second place, this lesson, in all the various

tones and forms of language and expression in which it is unfolded, and in the many different subjects which it embraces, derives a striking signification, and assumes the character of more than human purpose, in its wonderful adaptation to meet the forms of evil which have since arisen and prevailed. For surely it could be no other wisdom than that to which times and seasons are known, which devised the pattern of the Ark, found so well suited for the storms through which it was to pass. And here again, though our attention may be arrested by the human instruments or incidental occasions which have served to produce the effects noticed, still a variety of contingencies, looking now one way, then another, now behind, and then before, yet all leading to one great end; may be considered to indicate, as in the mysterious figure, and in the language of the Prophet before referred to, that though "the face and the hand of a man" might appear, yet there was something within them wholly Divine, for "the SPIRIT "was in the wheels;" "whithersoever the SPIRIT was to go, they "went, thither was their Spirit to go." And again, "They "turned not as they went, but to the place whither the head "looked they followed it;" and every part of their multiform and varied shape was "full of eyes round about." (Ezek. ii. and x.)

Now before we look on the aspect of things around us, Scripture itself points out the quarter from which the danger is to be apprehended in the latter days, as leading to the great Apostasy. "The man of sin," who is to be revealed, is the *ὁ ἀνὼμος*, or *rejecter of laws*. The "mystery which already worketh" is that of *lawlessness*, (*τῆς ἀνομίας*, 2 Thess. ii. 7.) That which is to "abound," as the witness to all nations extends itself, is "*lawlessness*," (*τὴν ἀνομίαν*, Matt. xxiv. 12.) It is Love which is THE KEEPING OF THE COMMANDMENTS," which is to wax cold; the "great delusion" is to be sent on men, because "they have "pleasure in UNRIGHTOUSNESS:" a "form of godliness is to exist "wherein the power is denied."

If therefore we only look to the inspired Prophecy, we have the character of the evils which are to assail us; but we have ore than this, we have these very evils in a striking manner developed before our eyes. Our times are remarkable for pre-

seating living evidences of this tendency ; this spirit (under the name of liberty) is the proverbial characteristic of our nation ; the irregular forms of religion which prevail must be considered (whatever good may at first find a lodging in them,) as more or less modified shapes of "*lawlessness*." But more than this, the religion of the day will be apt to derive its colour and complexion from the prevailing tendencies of the world around it ; and that peculiar form which now most abounds, so much so as to have formed for itself a system, rejecting the restraints of ancient doctrine, has this for its most marked feature, that it has substituted something else for the keeping of the Commandments. Indeed it is well known how much it has evinced a peculiar shrinking sensitiveness against the very mention of obedience, holiness of life, and the like. It will be curious, therefore, if it can be shown, that throughout the changes which the Church has undergone, by alterations little and great, whether designed or accidental, there is a pervading tendency to introduce, and bring out the mention of the Commandments, in the very way to which this age is so repugnant. Nay, it will be more than curious, in connection with the errors alluded to ; it will indicate a purpose beyond that of man, regulating those alterations which have interfered with the strict pattern of ancient worship ; the controlling Presence of that SPIRIT that beareth witness.

Before we enter upon the particular points of Obedience, infused throughout our Services, as the preservative against the spirit of *lawlessness*, we cannot but notice the great and broad line, the basis itself, upon which our Liturgy is constructed. In our Reformation we differ from other Reformations, and as a Church we differ, I think, from other Churches now existing, in retaining more purely and entirely the threefold cord which is not easily broken, Scripture, Tradition, and the Sacraments. Holy Scripture itself, as well as our own natural wisdom, will assure us that in these three will be our safety against the influences of the great deceiver of the latter days. To the Sacraments our blessed SAVIOUR has attached the promise of His Presence ; for "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ;" and "he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in Me, and I

40 *Scripture and Tradition combined in the Prayer Book.*

“in him.” And the voice of God, whether oral or written, “the traditions which we have been taught, whether by word or “epistle,” St. Paul has pointed out as the anchor we are to hold by. These three, the Sacraments “generally necessary to salvation,” the Word written, and the traditionary system which conveys both of these down to us¹, (the Sacraments by Stewards to administer, and the Word by authority to establish it Divine,) are our sacred threefold charge. Now all these we have preserved to us in an Apostolic form of worship, like the Ark of the Covenant, made indeed by the hands of man, but under the direction of God, in the keeping of which this our deposit lies.

4. *Scripture and Tradition combined in the Prayer Book.*

Now it may be observed at first sight how the Prayer Book has providentially preserved to us this two-fold bond of Tradition and Scripture, thereby supplying us with, or intimating to us, the Rule of Faith, by the insertion of Catholic documents of different ages together with Sacred Scripture. For instance, by the place which the Te Deum occupies, as allowed to be used indiscriminately with the Canticle from the Apocryphal writings, and as a Scriptural Hymn or Psalm; for it is observable that the other six Hymns answering to these are all from the Scripture. The same may be said of the use of the three Creeds. And with regard to the Athanasian Creed, thus considered in the light of a witness, it may be observed that the frequent use of it is owing to the second Book of King Edward, which has appointed it thirteen times instead of six. Thus have we the two threads throughout mutually interwoven with each other; not in any way as equivalent in authority, but as combining for our use in instruction and devotion. Add to these the Collects, which are mostly retained as traditional; and the Epistles and Gospels, which also occupy the respective place they hold on each Sunday as traditional. And, moreover, it is to be thankfully remembered

¹ If any one doubt the correctness of this assertion, he may be asked, in what way or system are the Word and Sacraments conveyed to us except by Tradition. Let some other way or system be mentioned which excludes Tradition, and yet brings any persons in these days to the knowledge of the Gospel.

that where the words are not those of the Catholic Church, the words substituted are not, generally speaking, those of an individual, but those of Scripture. Such is the case in the Exhortation at the Communion Service, and in the new Collects. Those that are altered are formed upon the Epistle and Gospel for the day. By this circumstance, while Scripture is made the basis, the mould and form is still according to a traditionary and Catholic system¹. And there is another point of view in which this adherence is valuable, that an unity and harmony of spirit is thus in some measure preserved with other Churches, both ancient and modern. Surely such an agreement, though it might appear to be but in things external and formal, yet cannot but be pleasing to Him who is the lover of concord; "who maketh men to be of one mind in an house," and who has made it the very condition of His blessings, that "two or three shall agree together touching any thing that they shall ask." This may appear but a slight matter, as it refers only to the language, but it is the peculiar blessing of the day of Pentecost, that the children of the SPIRIT should speak but one tongue, while the curse of Babel still abides on the world. And surely it is no unpleasing nor uninspiring thought, that on the same day the sons of the SPIRIT should be putting up the same spiritual supplications, though separated by nations and tongues, yea, though time and death should rise between, yet that we should in a manner be made one in CHRIST; that we should be joined in spirit, and use daily the same words which our forefathers have used for a thousand years, and which, if it be not our own fault, our children's children shall continue to use.

5. The Collects for Advent.

But to return to the point alluded to, viz. the provision made against the evils of the latter days, let us take up the first Collects. It so happens that it is in this season of Advent, that the

¹ The newly made Collects being formed on the subject of the Epistle and Gospel for the day, is also a proof that this connection or reference had been observed in the ancient service, although such allusions are not always so strictly preserved in the translation.

chief alterations in the Sunday services have been made. Nor does there appear any reason, humanly speaking, why the former ones should have been rejected; they are not in themselves at all objectionable¹. And now if the advance of time and the approach of the last days would naturally have required any change, it would be at this period of the sacred year:—a change, however, which it was not for man to provide, but for Him who may be thus forming His Church as a providential witness against undeveloped errors, and rendering it instrumental in the preparations for that Day, which is known to neither man nor angel, but to Himself alone.

The first Collect is entirely new in this place: and instead of the words of “rejoicing according to the flesh for the coming of “Thy only-begotten Son,” in that form which Mr. Palmer quotes as resembling it, it takes up in prayer the language of the Epistle, “*that we may cast off the works of darkness, and put upon us the armour of light* ;” seizing this point from the ancient Epistle which speaks of “the night being far spent.” By this we are reminded at once of the position described above, as the one in which we are placed, as those who amidst the corruptions of the latter days, the eating and drinking foretold, are looking out for the second Advent. In this prayer the Gospel also is combined with the Epistle, as furnishing the *lesson of humility* from the first coming, in order to carry on our thoughts to the second coming, “*to judge both the quick and dead.*” All that is new in Advent appears to represent that voice which speaks in the Revelations—“Remember how thou hast received and heard, “and hold fast and repent. If thou shalt not watch, I will come “on thee as a thief.” (iii. 3.) Surely the two following Collects do

¹ The Collect for the first Sunday in Advent in the Sarum and Roman Missals is not unlike our own for the fourth. That for the second is, “Stir up, O LORD, our hearts to prepare the ways of Thine only begotten SON, that through “His coming we may be made meet to serve Thee with purified minds, through”... That for the third Sunday in Advent in the Latin form, was, as retained in the Books of Edward, “LORD, we beseech Thee, give ear to our prayers, and by Thy “gracious visitation lighten the darkness of our heart, by our LORD JESUS “CHRIST.” The fourth was the same which we now have, excepting for the changes alluded to. The Collects for the last Sunday in Trinity and the two first Sundays in Advent, begun with the same word, “*Excite,*” “*stir up.*”

no less so. Being for the most part new, they adopt the language of the Epistles and Gospel, and in so doing, bring forth, providentially, the two great witnesses to "make ready and prepare the way," the Scriptures and the Church (as if saying, "Remember how thou hast received and heard"). For both of them flowing from the ancient Epistles, render the admonition they contain, not one of man's device, but Catholic and Divine. Nor was this combination of the twofold testimony introduced by the same persons or at the same time. The second Collect is found in the Books of King Edward; the third was only inserted at the last Review: both of them derive force from the dangers with which the truth has been assailed in the two quarters in which these are calculated to support it? the one from the suppression of Scripture, the other from the extensive rejection which has since prevailed of "*the ministers and stewards of God's mysteries.*" The last of the two Collects referred to, not only takes up these words from the Epistle, but corroborates its testimony from the Gospel of the day, also by the example of the Baptist sent before to prepare the coming, and inserts the striking words of "*turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just,*" in doing which, CHRIST's ministers are now to resemble the great Forerunner. The ancient Collect, indeed, for the second week in Advent, spoke of "preparing the way," but this of the mode of doing so, viz. by the twofold witness.

But the next Sunday, the fourth in Advent, instead of taking up, as on the former occasions, the language of the Epistle, which speaks of "rejoicing alway," because "the LORD is at hand," retains the old Collect, which forcibly describes our position before alluded to, "*as sore let and hindered, through our sins and wickedness.*" And it is to be noticed, that, as the preceding Collect inserted in the translation the expression of "*turning the hearts of the disobedient,*" so this in rendering the old form has introduced the words "*in running the race that is set before us.*" This took place at the last Review, the former expression being "may speedily deliver us through the satisfaction of Thy SON our LORD."—Few words, indeed, thus introduced, but the insertion of them implies a peculiarity, and that peculiarity is the lesson of

obedience. And, indeed, while on this subject, it may be observed that the Collect for the last week after Trinity had in like manner turned to Advent, as the end of that obedience which the Sundays after Trinity had inculcated, for it alters the words "the remedies of Thy goodness" in the old form, into "*may of Thee be plenteously rewarded,*"—apparently to turn the thoughts to the approaching Advent.

6. *Other new Collects.*

To dwell at present on the more important alterations. It is a circumstance quite in harmony with those just spoken of, and goes to establish the same point which may be observed throughout, that the Collects which are partly or entirely new, and as such appear to rise, as it were, accidentally out of the Epistle and Gospel, maintain and infuse into our religion some great and fundamental principle which has been signally endangered. This is so much the case, that there appears hardly any instance of change without this result; so that wherever the ancient line of the Church system appears broken, it would seem as if this had been in order to throw out a pier or bulwark in a direction in which the weight of the storm, though unforeseen by man, was likely to bear most heavily. Ever as we proceed in the enquiry, let us remember that it be with reverence—"No heart can think upon these things worthily, and who is able to conceive His ways?" (Ecclus. xvi. 20.)

In passing through the Collects, the next which we find to be new is the beautiful Collect for Charity¹ on the last Sunday before Lent; which, though it is only the subject of the Epistle converted into Prayer, and therefore undesigned, yet one can scarcely fail to regard as a pillar of warning set up before the opening of Lent, against the abuse of fasting by the Romanists to the loss of Charity. And this is the more remarkable, as the Collect in the Sarum Missal, occurring with the same Epistle and

¹ The Collect in the Sarum Missal (with the same Epistle and Gospel) for which this is instituted is as follows, not, it will be seen, in itself objectionable, "Hear, we beseech Thee, O LORD, our Prayers with thy mercy, and loosing us from the chains of our sins, keep us from all adversity; through . . .

Gospel for which this is substituted, is not in itself objectionable. But as if in preparation for a still greater danger to ensue, from the Puritans soon to follow, and the scoffers of the last days, on the next Sunday, the first in Lent, there is inserted into the old form, and that too from the Gospel for the day, the example of Him, "*who for our sakes fasted forty days and forty nights.*" Surely this is as if the witness were thus putting the subject of fasting on the very highest grounds, and appealing to us by a petition which it puts into our mouths, the most solemn that can be expressed, that we fail not to follow that example; and the more solemn, because addressed to our LORD Himself¹.

Not less important is that on Christmas-day. The doctrine which is expressed in that Collect being on a subject which has assumed lately a controversial character, the Collect has become familiarly known to us, as a point of appeal in our defence of that Catholic truth as the doctrine of our Church. But it is not known that these words which imply Baptismal Regeneration are not found in either of the Latin forms to which Mr. Palmer has traced that prayer, so that it appears in the light of an accidental introduction. The words in one of these forms are, "that as He is the Author to us of Divine generation, so He "may be the giver of immortality:" in the other, "that they "who are redeemed by Thy grace may be safe in Thine adoption." Neither of which it will be seen, contains the doctrine in question, viz. of our "*being regenerate and made children by "adoption.*" The two ancient forms might be used with propriety even by those who deny this doctrine.

But in no case is the alteration more worthy of notice, than that which has taken place on Easter Even. Were one to be asked, what was the great cardinal doctrine which the popular tide has been most set against, both under the name of religion, and from the prevailing spirit of the world, especially since the changes of 1688, we must say, I think, that it is the true doctrine of the Cross, of our being baptized into CHRIST's death, being dead, and buried, and crucified with Him. The pains taken to

¹ Both of these prayers are in the first Book of Edward.

explain it away, the impatience evinced at every practical principle flowing from it, would lead one to think that veiled under various names this was the great design of the adversary, to feed the fancies of mankind with the name of CHRIST crucified, while he takes from them the power of it, as connected with mortification. The Cross in which we would glory, is not that by which the world is crucified unto us, and we unto the world : and it is observable that the new doctrine which has prevailed is studiously separated from Baptism. The tree of grace is not, as in the Psalmist, planted by the water-side. This religion of the day was not developed at the last Review, when this Collect was first inserted, much less at the time of King Edward's first Book, which adopted the Epistle which brings forward the same Doctrine. Nor does it appear that this Doctrine pervades other Liturgies on this day. The Latin Collect, from which Mr. Palmer considers it to be translated, does not contain this allusion. The two forms are as follows :

Our own Collect.

Grant, O LORD, that as we are baptized into the death of Thy blessed Son, our Saviour JESUS CHRIST, so by continually mortifying our corrupt affections, we may be buried with Him ; and that through the grave and gate of death we may pass to our joyful Resurrection, for His merits who died and was buried, and rose again for us, Thy Son JESUS CHRIST our LORD.

The Old Collect translated.

O CHRIST, favour our desires and prayers, and grant that the approaching night of the sacred Passover may be prosperous to us, in which rising again from death with Thee, we may be thought worthy to pass unto life, O Saviour of the world, who livest—*et reliqua.*

7. The Collects for Saints' days.

And now consider the Collects of our Saints' days, where the chief alterations¹ occur. Compare them with the ancient forms, and con-

¹ " God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our LORD JESUS CHRIST,

² It appears from the *Origines Liturgicæ*, that they are new all but five, (excepting indeed the three at Christmas,) and two out of that number are those for the Annunciation and the Purification, where we retain the old, which is worthy of notice, as implying that on this great point of difference between us and Rome,

sider how their more doctrinal as well as practical character distinguishes them from the Latin, which, if not objectionable, (as many are on the Saints' days,) yet are more eucharistical, festal, choral (so to speak). Observe how, as in the former instances of Collects which are new, so in these also, great doctrines, since lost or lightly esteemed among Protestants, are providentially put forth. If through the third week of Advent solemn mention is made of "*the Stewards of God's mysteries*," on St. Peter's day¹ we have the same spoken of as "*Bishops and Pastors*," "*who are to preach the word*," "*and the people obediently to follow the same*." On St. Simon and St. Jude's day, we have the *Church*² *built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*; "by whose doctrines we pray that we may be so joined together in unity, that we be made an holy temple." And if on this day we have one Article of our Creed, that for "the Holy Catholic Church," converted into prayer, the following Article which has been equally forgotten, "the Communion of Saints," has been introduced on the next Festival, that of All Saints, which speaks of "*the Elect being knit together in one Communion and Fellowship, in the mystical Body of Christ our Lord*;" still adding, as always, the lesson of obedience and prayer, for "*following the Saints in all virtuous and godly living*;" and though

viz., the light in which the blessed Virgin is to be held, our appeal is to antiquity. Another Collect is for Michaelmas-day, of which the same in some degree may be said. In the other, that of St. Bartholomew, the words are altered which spoke of "*the holy rejoicing in that festivity*."

¹ The Latin Collect for this day, (June 29,) combines the commemoration of St. Paul; but there is another beautiful Latin Collect for St. Peter, on the 1st of August. *Petri Apost. ad vincula*. So that there exists an ancient form.

² The word "*Church*" was only inserted in this Collect at the last Review, instead of the word "*congregation*;" the same was the case on the 16th after Trin.

The Latin Collect for this day in the Sarum Missal, and Parisian Breviary, is as follows: "O GOD, who hast given unto us, through Thy blessed Apostles, Simon and Jude, to come to the knowledge of Thy name, grant unto us that while we celebrate their eternal glory, we may be ourselves profited in doing so, and that this our profit may best celebrate them, through our LORD;—(*eorum gloriam sempiternam et proficiendo celebrare et celebrando proficere*.)"

it speaks of "*unspeakable joys*," in accordance with a Latin form¹ which was perhaps the basis of it, yet even here it immediately returns to remind us of the condition of obedience, "*which Thou hast prepared for those that unfeignedly love Thee.*"

These are great points of ancient and lately forgotten doctrine; but where this is not the case, observe how they all strike on the same chord of obedience; how, ever and anon, at one time or another, in this or that shape, this lesson it is which has been introduced. Take the very first, that for St. Andrew's day; that which was previously issued in Edward's first Book was as follows: "ALMIGHTY GOD, which hast given such grace to Thy Apostle Saint Andrew, that he counted the sharp and painful death of the Cross to be *an high honour and great glory*; grant us to take and esteem all troubles and adversities which shall come unto us for Thy sake, as things profitable for us toward the obtaining of everlasting life; through JESUS CHRIST our LORD."

This is rejected, and in the second Book of Edward we have our present Collect, that "*as Saint Andrew readily obeyed the calling of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and followed Him without delay*," so we may give over² "*ourselves obediently to follow Thy holy commandments.*" But it is not till the last Review that the same lesson is introduced into St. Philip and St. James's day. In both of Edward's Books, that prayer consists of only the first half of our present Collect, but we have afterwards inserted, that "*following their steps we may stedfastly walk in the way that leadeth to eternal life.*"

In like manner we may observe that it is the same string which is touched upon in all these changes, instead of the spiritual

¹ That for All Saints' day is as follows in the Sarum and Roman Missals: "O LORD, our God, multiply upon us Thy grace, and grant that as we celebrate their glorious solemnities, so we may, by an holy profession, attain unto their joys, through,"—"Domine Deus noster, multiplica super nos gratiam tuam, et quorum prævenimus gloriosa solemnia tribue subequei in sanctâ professione lætitiâ: Per—" This also it will be perceived is more festal, less doctrinal and practical, than our own.

² Now "give up."

rejoicing of the festival, the same chord is struck, simple, solemn, and deep; and if there are varied intonations, these are but the varied forms, the particular duties, of obedience. On St. James's day we pray that we "*forsaking all worldly and carnal affections, may be evermore ready to follow God's holy commandments*;" on St. Matthew's day, that we may "*forsake all covetous desires and inordinate love of riches, and follow Christ*;" "on St. Luke's day "*that the diseases of our souls may be healed*;" on St. Mark's that "*we may not be carried about with every blast of vain doctrine*;" on St. John the Baptist's that we may "*speak the truth,*" "*rebuke vice,*" and "*patiently suffer for the truth*;" on the day of the Holy Innocents, we pray for "*mortification and innocency of life*;" on "the Conversion of St. Paul," that we "*may show our thankfulness, by following the doctrine which he taught*;" whereas in the old books (the Sarum Missal and Brev. and the Roman Missal and Brev.) it is in the higher tone, that "through his example we may proceed unto Thee¹;" in the Collect for St. John the Evangelist, it is added, even at the last Review, that "*we may walk in the light of the truth*"—words not found in the old form, nor in the Books of King Edward.

8. Verbal alterations on this subject.

There are many instances where, when the Latin Prayer is preserved, expressions of this kind are, as it were, casually inserted which speak of the commandments. It has been remarked on the fourth of Advent, that the mention of "*running the race that is set before us*" comes into the translation. There is a similar instance on the eleventh after Trinity Sunday, "*running the way of thy commandments*;" on the thirteenth after Trinity, "*that we may so faithfully serve Thee in this life.*" In the Collect for the Circumcision we find the old Latin words, "that He may pour into us His benediction," changed into "*we may in all things obey Thy blessed will*;" and this alteration occurs in the First of Edward, and the mention of "*mortifying our members*" is also newly inserted into the same.

¹ "*Per ejus ad Te exempla gradiamur.*"

Again, if we take our Litany in parallel columns with the Latin forms, as it occurs in the "*Origines Liturgicæ*," the petitions to which no parallel is found are mainly these :

"From all sedition, privy conspiracy, and rebellion, from all false doctrine, heresy ("and schism" at the last review), from hardness of heart, and contempt of Thy word and commandment."

And *"That it may please Thee to give us an heart to love and dread Thee, and diligently to live after Thy commandments".*¹

And in the concluding Collect the addition of these words ; *"That in all our troubles we may put our whole trust and confidence in Thy mercy, and evermore serve Thee in holiness and pureness of living."*

Now fully to see the force of these alterations, we must consider not only the vast importance of words with which the Church approaches to the ALMIGHTY GOD, by which (if we may say it, with awe and submission,) the mystical Bride makes known her wants to the Bridegroom, but the practicable effect they have in infusing something, day after day, year after year, into the very soul of our religious character and complexion, while

¹ If there be weight in this line of argument, the subsequent omission of the words which occur in the Books of Edward, "from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities," would seem to imply not only the more sober state of feeling which had ensued during Queen Mary's reign, but that the danger which our Church has to apprehend is not from that quarter ; if these changes are, as we suppose, divinely regulated provisions. A similar expression against Rome was also in a rubric after the Communion "of idolatry to be abhorred by all faithful Christians." But of course such inferences are to be made with caution and humility. Although Romanism must ever be in this country one of the worst forms of dissent, it is, however, curious to observe that while we have been continuing the practice to "abjure as damnable and heretical" the doctrine that Kings, excommunicated by the Court of Rome, may be dethroned and murdered by their subjects, two Kings have been dethroned, and one of them murdered, by the opposite, or ultra-Protestant, factions. And highly interesting and instructive is it to reflect, that as it was artfully contrived that William should be received on the fifth of November, the consequence of this was, that the Church, in her Service for that day, was throughout the country reading her lesson of loyal allegiance, and raising her protest against that Rebellion. See especially the Epistle for that day.

the very tone of the expressions is apt to dwell on our outward ears. And that, independently of these considerations, the mere mention of "the commandments" and of "obedience" is of great value, will appear from the extreme fastidiousness which certain persons of peculiar opinions entertain against them, and the great pains they take to prevent the occurrence of such words. But in addition to what has been said of the Prayers, if we take the sentences at the Offertory in our own Communion Service, which are not that I know of to be found elsewhere, we can scarce find a clearer instance of our distinctive character. They are all, we know, a practical appeal to good works or almsgiving. Instead of these continued sentences, in the Sarum and Roman Missal there is after the Creed which succeeds the Gospel, one or more verses in the way of anthem, called "offertorium," either of prayer or thanksgiving. They might be quoted in contrast to our own, but that, alluding to the Gospel just read, they would not be understood without it. They are found in Edward's first Book as we have them now.

9. *Omission of the Festival of St. Mary Magdalene.*

In speaking of the Saints' days, there is an omission which bears as much upon the view here taken as the additions and alterations alluded to, an omission which appears so singularly providential in many ways, that it cannot be passed over; that of an entire festival, the day of St. Mary Magdalene, which found a place in the first Book of Edward. The Service for this day went entirely on the supposition that Mary Magdalene was the sinner spoken of in the 7th chapter of St. Luke. This opinion is inserted in the heading of our translation of the Bible, and is alluded to by good men of those times and the preceding centuries without doubt or hesitation. Yet it has been supposed on inquiry, to be not at all supported by the Fathers, and to have had its origin in a Popish legend¹. Now we know that one Mary has had her good deed recorded as a memorial of her to all nations,

¹ See the statement of an inquiry on this subject in Bishop Heber's Remains. In this Day's Service in the Paris. Brev. there is no allusion to her being "a sinner."

and it would be painful to think we might be commemorating another in a character of which she was guiltless. Nor is there any other Service in the Prayer Book, through the good Providence of God, which we should be so much tempted to wish removed. And it is evident, independently of this consideration, that the practical tendency of this Service would have been, more than any other, to sanction the lax opinions which prevail respecting a late conversion.

10. *The Epistles and Gospels.*

The same tendency, which has been noticed as pervading the Collects, may be also observed of the passages of Scripture which are new in our Prayer Book. To take some of the Epistles which are partly or entirely altered. That for the first Sunday in Advent has added the former part to the Epistle as it stood in the Sarum and Roman missals. And what is this addition? The second table of the Commandments, as the subject of preparation for the second Advent, the object of that Epistle being to remind us of "the night far spent and the day at hand." In like manner, on the Sunday after Ascension Day, only one sentence was prefixed to the former Epistle, but that sentence is such that, when once connected with it, it speaks through the whole Epistle; "*The end of all things is at hand*!" This harmonizes with all

¹ That this preparation for judgment, and calls to obedience with reference to it, and also warnings against false doctrines and teachers, does, in a remarkable and peculiar manner, pervade the Services of our Church, and that this is not a mere imaginary supposition, will derive confirmation from a Service entirely new at the last review of the Prayer Book, and the mention of which has been omitted. It is that for the sixth Sunday after the Epiphany. It seems impossible that any combination of Collect, Epistle, and Gospel could teach these more fully, more strongly, or more beautifully than these do. And observe how it arises out of the previous Offices. The star appearing, the child in the temple, the first miracle, the heathen centurion, the going over to the Gadarenes, the visible Church in which the tares will be blended with the wheat, are the subjects in succession of the previous Sundays, as varied and gradual manifestations or Epiphanies, and found in the old forms; but observe this new Service for the sixth after the Epiphany arises, as it were, and unfolds itself into the great and last manifestation

the other changes : is it not, to recur to a former allusion, is it not, I say, to be received as from Him who repeats so often in the Revelations, "Behold, I come quickly ;" and "If thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief?" It was observed that on St. John's day, the expression of "*walking in the light of God's truth*" was inserted in the Collect. It is curious to observe that this was only taking up the practical lesson and very words of the Epistle, which is from the first of St. John, on obedience as the only test of our acceptance and sincerity: "*If we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of CHRIST cleanseth us from all sin.*" This Epistle, moreover, is itself new in Edward's first Book; that in the Missals being from the 15th chapter of Ecclesiasticus. And indeed the custom of adding to the length of the Epistle in our Church is itself of this character, for it implies more of a practical *ἥθος*. Our Church reads more of Scripture as serving for instruction, less as eucharistic and choral, in the manner of the Breviaries.

Take again the new Epistle for St. Simon and St. Jude's day; for it is new as it now is in our Prayer Book. In the Sarum Missal the Epistle is from that to the Romans, chap. viii.; on the very exalted state of the Christian, "Who can separate us from the love of CHRIST?" *et reliqua*. In the Roman Missal it is from the Epistle to the Ephesians; the no less exalted description of the Christian privileges (c. iv.); "Till we all come unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of CHRIST." Instead of this we have that awful Epistle from St. Jude, of which, compare but the termination with those of the preceding two: "These filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities." A solemn warning of the evils of the last days; which is forcibly contrasted with that high confidence expressed in both of the Epistles alluded to in the Missals; and it would appear as if the Collect itself derived

of the Day of Judgment, and connects it with the former manifestations as preparatory. But it may be noticed that this, and all the changes at the last Review, are more expressive of Christian hope; and this slight change of tone may be connected with circumstances hereafter to be observed.

a peculiar interest from its connexion with the Epistle, which speaks of "earnestly contending for the Faith once delivered "unto the Saints."

The observations made on the Collect for Easter Even may be also carried on to the Epistle for that day, which is also new; inasmuch as it bears upon the doctrine spoken of in that Collect, viz. of our being buried with CHRIST in baptism, as strongly as any passage that could be extracted from Scripture: for the lesson which it inculcates is, that we should patiently suffer after the example of CHRIST, and that it is Baptism, containing a good conscience consenting to God, which doth save us. If any other passage in the Epistles states more fully the doctrine of our "being crucified with the world and the world to us," one would think it is the conclusion of that to the Galatians; and it is an interesting fact to perceive that there is only one Epistle in all the Sundays after Trinity for which Mr. Palmer finds no authority in previous Liturgies, that for the fifteenth Sunday, and that Epistle is no other than this passage from the Epistle to the Galatians. One instance more may be mentioned; on the fourth Sunday after the Epiphany, the Epistle is one substituted for another¹ in the Sarum from the same chapter; and the subject of it is on submission to appointed authorities; and it is curious to notice that this Lesson here substituted, as it were by accident, for another, has been one so necessary from the times ensuing, that an Epistle similar to it from St. Peter has been since appointed three times in the State Services.

11. *Service for Passion Week.*

What has been said of the Collect and Epistle for Easter Even, may be considered as furnishing a key to the better understanding of the Services for that week, which are peculiar. We find that in the Breviaries, the Prophet Jeremiah is very much used at this time; and in Edward's first Book, the Lessons for this day and

¹ The reason for the substitution seems to have been, that the one in the Sarum had been added to that for Advent Sunday.

the Thursday are from the same Prophet: whereas our own has entirely adopted the historical narrative of His sufferings, and the Collect for the week sets before us the example of our SAVIOUR as the point of view in which the season is considered, and thus gives us the spirit of our own Church as being *peculiarly and entirely practical*. The tone of other Churches is that of sympathy; ours of admonition. Others have the language of the Lamentations, such as might become the blessed Virgin at the cross, or "the beloved Disciple;" ours is as if our LORD turned and said, "Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and "for your children:" or "not every one that saith unto me, "LORD, LORD . . . but he that doeth the will of my FATHER." A comparison with the Breviaries will strongly indicate this peculiarity, for there is, perhaps nothing in which we differ more from the Breviaries than we do in the Services for Passion Week. The Epistle for Good Friday also appears to be new; and its position must strike every one, as bringing forward the Divinity of our LORD on that occasion, as the very central doctrine from which others emanate and diverge in various ways; the denial of which is the consummation of "lawlessness" of the latter days, and to which all disobedience and disloyalty in heart and practice to our SAVIOUR necessarily tends. And it is placed at this point, it would seem, by way of protection, lest, when the example of our LORD is so much urged, we should forget how infinitely holy the ground is on which we stand. And yet, coming round to the previous lesson of obedience, it ends with these remarkable words: "*Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering, provoking unto love and good works; exhorting one another, and so much the more as ye see the day approaching.*"

There appears, in other points, a certain preparation pervading the Liturgy as it has come down to us, as if against a time when the "love of the many shall have waxed cold," and "he who endureth to the end" may be singular. In Edward's second Book there was this rubric; "And there shall be no celebration of the LORD's Supper, excepting there be a good number to communicate with the priest:" and in Edward's first Book, the

priest was not required to say the daily Service without a congregation. The present rubric must be considered as a rule providentially preserved, of great value, containing, as it does, a silent witness by which the Church does what she can to provide both for the personal holiness of her ministers, and also to preserve their intercessory character, keeping the rule in that quiet reserve peculiar to her. To these may be added the Prayer of St. Chrysostom, introduced out of the usual course, from the Greek and not from the Latin, holding forth the blessing, "*where two or three are gathered together,*" as if by an anticipation that it might come to this, that two or three only might be found, which is now often the case.

12. *The Vow of Obedience at Baptism new.*

But now all the circumstances as yet spoken of may be considered as in a manner but external and preliminary to two important changes, expressive of this principle, which have found their place in the inner sanctuary of our religious worship. Or rather the things alluded to may be looked upon as forming something of a new and peculiar system, raised imperceptibly, with no noise or sound heard in the temple, by an invisible Hand, and of which the change first to be mentioned is as it were the key-stone. It is a new and distinct vow introduced into our Baptismal promise, which did not find a place there till the last Review in the year 1661 : the third vow, as it now stands ; that of obedience : "*Wilt thou then obediently keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of thy life ?*"

The promise was indeed alluded to in the Catechism, as it now is, from the time of King Edward's first Book ; and even had it not been, it would of course be thoroughly implied, and the same may be said of all the other alterations spoken of, for of course obedience is, in every Church, the beginning and end of all Christianity. But what is maintained is, that it brings out in an express and declaratory manner, and lays a stress and emphasis on certain words as in an earnest admonition, by which a peculiar

tone and character is given to the command, so as to convey a new force. All, therefore, that has been said of the Services in general may in this light be considered as but indications of this new Baptismal engagement, which thus pervades the whole Prayer Book with its own appropriate and distinctive marks. And sometimes even in its own Baptismal words, as in the Collect for Easter Even, and in a trifling change in the translation of that for the 18th after Trinity, where "*vitare diabolica contagia*" is rendered, "*to withstand the temptations of the world, the flesh and the devil.*" Adopting in the translation words from the Baptismal service.

13. *Other peculiarities new in the Baptismal service.*

Indeed the deep and humbling tone of mortification which the above Prayer for Easter Even expresses, is throughout the characteristic of our own Baptismal office. We find the Prayer after Baptism going off from the Latin form (given in the *Origines Liturgicæ*), into these words entirely its own, "*We beseech Thee to grant that he being dead unto sin, and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in His death, may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin; and that as he is made partaker of the death of Thy Son, he may also be partaker of His resurrection.*" In the Latin there is none of this, but only that they may "preserve what they have received by integrity of life." Another ancient form in the same place is strongly contrasted in its tone with ours.

Compare also the circumstances and Prayers of Baptism in Edward's First Book, with those which we now have. The immersion in the former is followed by this prayer.

"Take this white vesture for a token of the innocence which, by God's grace, in this holy Sacrament of Baptism, is given unto thee; and for a sign whereby thou art admonished, so long as thou livest, to give thyself to innocency of living." Instead of this we have the signing with the Cross, and the Prayer connected with it, "*of not being ashamed to confess the Faith of*

"Christ crucified." A Prayer which formerly preceded Baptism, but is here made to us, in conjunction with that action, to convey the very sign of our Baptismal profession. This retaining of the sanctifying, and perhaps half sacramental, use of the Cross, is of itself very significative, particularly in this place; it is withdrawn indeed into the shade, as if in judgment for the profanation it had undergone; but it thus has its use sanctioned by our Church, and is made to be like an emblem, the corner-stone of our profession, a type and badge of our state, instead of the white vestment. The emblem of mortification we retain, but not that of innocence. There are several minor alterations in the Baptismal service of this character. The words "*that he may not be ashamed to confess the Faith of Christ crucified;*" and to "*continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end;*" and that "*he may be endued with heavenly virtues;*" are not in the ancient forms given in the Origines Liturgicæ. And although there is a parallel form found to our promise, yet the words "*walk in the same all the days of thy life,*" are new. Moreover the following high words of the Latin find no place in our present form, "*Templum Dei ingredere.*" "*Sit filius thalami Tui nuptialis, et hæres regni tui inamissibilis et perennis.*"

All these observations, respecting the Office itself, derive an additional force from another peculiarity in the Anglican Church, that of baptizing, as we are required to do, in the public Service of Morning or Evening Prayers; and the reason alleged for this injunction is, that "every man present may be put in remembrance of his own profession;" that is to say, in the warning voice of the Revelations, "that they remember from whence they are fallen, and repent, and do their first works." The effect of which custom, prescribed by our Church, may be seen in the fact, that as the practice of it is omitted, something else becomes substituted for Baptismal privileges, and Baptismal engagements are lost sight of. In short, the peculiarity of our condition is this: other Churches baptized at the great Festivals, and annually celebrated the same as a joyful solemnity with white robes. We introduce the baptism of others as a warning; set it before men as an involuntary and an unwelcome witness.

In a manner no less striking does the same distinction follow us to Confirmation also: it is surely very remarkable that the commencement of our present Office containing the "renewal of the solemn promise and vow" is not found in the Books of Edward; but only the latter part, of Sacramental grace given. In minor points also the same alterations and substitutions occur, introducing the lesson of obedience. A Prayer closely rendered from one given in the *Origines Liturgicæ* (excepting the allusion to the sign of the Cross as then made), proceeds in words of its own, "that they may be led in the knowledge and obedience of God's word." The other which is new, dwells on the same, "to direct, sanctify, and govern, both our hearts and bodies in the ways of Thy laws, and in the words of Thy commandments." Contrast these words, thus recurring, with the sensitive dislike evinced to the same in some modern systems, and consider their singularly expressive but silent protest¹.

¹ The addition to the Catechism at the last Review, respecting the Sacraments, is too important to escape notice; the more important as furnishing the basis, in fact the text book, for all catechetical teaching. Such a providential insertion respecting the Eucharist may be contrasted with the no less happy omission of an half ambiguous expression against the *real and essential* "Presence of CHRIST's natural Body and Blood" at the Communion, which found its way into Edward's Second Book. To this may be added not only the insertion of the Absolution at the Daily Service, but the alteration of the Rubric at the last Review. The Presbyterians showed a wish to have the word "*Priest*" always omitted, and supplied by the word "*Minister*:" this wish, implying the different sense they thought the two words capable of, attracted attention, and in consequence the word "*Minister*" was changed to that of "*Priest*" in this Rubric. Were it not for this word, the Absolution would now be read often by Deacons, as our own experience well tells us; and the power of Absolution thereby confounded.

Of the same kind is the discontinuance of Baptism by Laymen, allowed in Edward's Books, which would have been very disastrous in its consequences, from the laxity since prevailing.

Our thankfulness for the mention of the Sacraments in the Catechism is sometimes blended with regret at the want of what Nelson wished to have been added respecting the appointed "*Stewards of those Mysteries*." If it were not irreverent to hazard a thought at the purpose of the Divine Mercy, might we suppose that thus a door was allowed to be left as an opening given to those unlawful

14. The Decalogue in the Communion.

The other subject to be mentioned, where a change has found its place in the inner sanctuary of our worship, is the anomalous introduction of the Commandments into the Communion Service¹. The reading of Scripture Lessons in this part of our worship, which is mentioned as having authority, is not quite to the point. If they are to be moral precepts, why is it not from the Gospel? Why are they not the Beatitudes? Why, it may be said, are we to go back to the Law, and have the admonition of servants rather than sons?—Piercing indeed as a two edged sword, with its deep-searching meanings, and trying the reins: but why only the terrors of Mount Sinai? Why is there to be the sword of the SPIRIT only, and not also the oil and the wine for the wounds it makes, as in the Sermon on the Mount?

Or again, to look at secondary causes, what is the reason, humanly speaking, of their having been introduced? Is not the general effect the opposite to that which was in the thoughts of some of those who were most instrumental in these changes? If foreigners were the cause of its insertion, as also of the Confession and Absolution, and the more frequent use of the Athanasian

Ministries which are now awakening the Church from her lethargy, and have, in some measure, supplied her functions during the sleep that has pervaded her: for who can venture to say that those are worse than that state of spiritual destitution in which this country has left a great portion of her poor, the "pauperes CHRISTI" committed to her? And this, it may be observed, is the safer way of regarding these unlawful Ministries, viz. not as in any way justifiable, nor indeed to be looked upon, somewhat too theoretically, (which is the tendency of the late Mr. A. Knox's views of Wesleyan Methodism,) as actual Divine dispensations, but rather, we should suppose, as judicial visitations on the Church for her lukewarmness;—as modes of evil in men converted by the Author of all good into means of counteracting greater evil.

¹ "I do not find," says Bishop Cosins, "in any Liturgy, old or new, before 'this of the fifth of Edward the vi. here continued, that the Jews' Decalogue 'was used in the service of the Christian Church.'"

Creed, is it not remarkable that the antidote should have come to us from that quarter from which the opposite evils have prevailed? that they should have been the means of inserting into our Church those safeguards which they have not had in the unhappy condition of their own¹? Was it in order to bring forward the Fourth Commandment?—However that may be, it may be observed that the Law, like that command with respect to the Sabbath, is the external fence, the last bulwark, the last line of defence, against the spirit of “the lawless one.” In the first and literal sense, it alludes to things of which the Gospel says little or nothing, as of the keeping of the Sabbath, and speaks more to those who require to be awed by “the letter that killeth,” than encouraged by “the SPIRIT that giveth life².”

Must we not confess,—with love indeed for His mysterious and wonderful care, but with awe and trembling also,—must we not confess in these things, that it can be nothing else but the interposition of an invisible hand? For it is in fact the constant rehearsal of the same Baptismal promise of obedience; for it so happens that this is actually explained in the Catechism by the

¹ It has been the object throughout this treatise to set aside all consideration of persons and personal motives, or much might be said on the astonishing fact that those whose object it was, as it were, to Lutheranize our Church, to introduce Justification without Works, to lower the Sacramental sense of Absolution, were instrumental in preserving the contrary, as by the Confession, the Absolution, the Communion Service; and by the very tone of sadness unconsciously instilled, they bear evidence of having fallen away, rather than of renovation to first love.

² The present inquiry has only had reference to the Liturgy; it can therefore only be just mentioned, that in the Thirty-nine Articles the same practical cautions appear to be inserted; passages that might be omitted without injury to the Articles, such as indicate an indistinct apprehension (whether felt or not by the writers), of approaching *δυσωμία*, *e. g.* in Articles vii. ix. x. xii. xiv. xv. xvi. xvii. (especially) xxiii. xxvi. xxvii. xxix. xxxii. xxxiv. xxxviii. xxxix.

The argument from the Articles has, in one respect, a peculiar force on this subject, inasmuch as their being human compositions, and not like Scripture, or like Apostolic and Catholic Tradition, containing principles of universal obligation, or which are capable of universal application, their entire reference is to our own Church as such.

Ten Commandments¹. It is therefore this promise again and again brought before us at the approach to this Sacrament and at the Altar. It may also be noticed that the only authority which Mr. Palmer mentions for the introduction of the Decalogue itself, at all, is the use of a portion of it in the Anglican Church during Lent. So that here again that which was peculiar to a penitential season has become our appointed admonition for our Festivals and Eucharistic Service, and throughout the year. It was also used to be followed by a response not unlike what we now have, but not, it seems, repeated after each Commandment, which gives it a very expressive force. A response, indeed, so deeply penitent, that Bishop Sparrow says of it, "If there be any that think this might be spared, as fitter for poor publicans than saints, let them turn to the parable of the publican and Pharisee." He speaks of it, therefore, as bearing strongly this character of humiliation and penitence.

16. The general bearing of this argument on the former.

Now if this second point has been established, with respect to the principle of obedience being made in a very remarkable manner to pervade and distinguish the Services of the Anglican Church, the entire weight of this second argument may be added to all that has been said to establish that of the former treatise. For it may be observed, that if the language for the returning penitent in Scripture is, "I am not worthy to be called thy son, make me as one of thy hired servants;" it is equally clear that the language with which the penitent is received is such as this, "Repent, and do thy first works." "Cease to do evil, learn to do well." "When the wicked man doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive." And these may be considered to contain the sum and substance of the two princi-

¹ The Decalogue was inserted in the Catechism at the first of Edward, into the Communion Service at the second Book; the Baptismal promise of Obedience not till the last Review; therefore this remarkable harmony was, humanly speaking, accidental.

ples observed, both running continually into one, both mutually implying one another ; both sometimes are but one and the same thing looked at from a different point of view, like the convex and concave in a circle, which are in fact one and the same : the former mode of expression is ever putting into the mouth of the sinner, "enter not into judgment with thy servant ;" the latter is ever bringing before him, as such, the terms of his acceptance, "If thou doest well shalt thou not be accepted ?" Sometimes the same sentence may be considered to have an equal reference to both of the points stated, as in the words "faithfully serve Thee " in this life : " and in that penitential response to the Commandments just alluded to, for they express humiliation, and also the necessity of obedience. And as chastenings and admonitions are in this life of a remedial nature, it may be further observed, that it is this discipline of keeping the Commandments which restores us to the state of sons : "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever " I command you."

The benefit of this Heavenly and Divine guide dwelling among us which we have in the Church, thus after a superhuman manner calling us to repent, and then regulating our repentance, may be the more strongly seen by the instance of an irregular call of the same kind, which has extensively prevailed in this country by the teaching of Wesley and his followers. For this also may be considered as a call to repentance, like the Reformation ; the latter an attempt at recovery from the evils of Popery, the former from the lukewarmness which the principles of the Revolution in 1688 had infused into the Church. They differed in this, that one adhered to the protection of the Church, the other did not. One was authorized and commissioned, the other irregular and self-chosen ; and it is remarkable that the latter (*i. e.* Wesleyanism), in conveying a call to repentance, so treats the penitent, that persons are placed thereby, not in the position of servants, but are called to strong spiritual joys and assurances, and assume at once the character, as it were, of sons and the privileges of adoption. And not only this, but afterwards internal emotions and sensibly felt assurances are considered so essential as to take the place of obedience. And these two cir-

cumstances form, in fact, the very characteristic of that sect¹. Instead of these false encouragements and vain confidences, the Church, like a skilful physician, has endeavoured to allay the feverish impulses and passionate sentiments which are incident to such conversions and a late amendment of life; she has gently and almost imperceptibly infused into the whole of our religious system the recurrence week after week of humbling, yet soothing expressions, and calls to duty. Contrast these with the tendencies of Wesleyanism; which tendencies are in fact nothing else but the natural effects which follow when the truth breaks in upon a corrupt state of life: whereas it is the office of the Church to remedy and correct these workings of our depraved nature.

16. *Reflections.*

There is, however, doubtless in the subject in general, much more than we can comprehend: and, as in all matters of religion, whatever light we may attain unto only reveals mysteries far beyond our feeble imaginings, as a ray of moonlight to one who travels among mountains, or upon the sea at night. For, indeed, if we may be allowed reverently to take up these words in illustration, "His Righteousness is as the strong mountains; His judgments are like the great deep." "Lo, He goeth by us, and we see Him not: He passeth on also, but we perceive Him not." For though indeed we have spoken of the guidance of the Church as of an Angel sent to lead the way, yet from the promises of CHRIST's indwelling in His Church, we must remember that it is more than this: for though it is said indeed, "I send mine Angel before thee," yet it is added, "beware of him, and obey his voice, for my Name is in him."

And again, let it be observed, if the voice of God is addressed to the Church in England, with a peculiar and appropriate mes-

¹ Abundant instances of both these points might be adduced from the history and devotional books of these separatists, such as the *Journal of John Wesley, &c.*

sage, as it was to each of those Churches in the Book of the Revelations ; and if it be not to be heard by a miraculous and supernatural sound as then, in what way can the purport of it be ascertained unless it be by putting together in this manner detached sentences, and syllables, and words, which stand out from the natural order of events ? and when this is done they do, I feel assured, convey a Divine meaning so palpable and distinct, that he who would run on in the way of God's Commandments cannot fail to read it.

For what great and high destinies our Church may be intended in times yet to be revealed, that she should have been so signally protected ; or what "good thing the ALMIGHTY may have seen "in us" in days that are past, it were not for us to divine ; or, it may be, that any part of His Providence that comes most under our closer inspection, will be found in discernible characters, thus abounding in wisdom and goodness. However this may be, it were impossible, one would think, for the coldest heart to remain unmoved at the contemplation of such the footsteps of a mysterious and sleepless Providence, ever on the watch over us to do us good, whether we wake or sleep ; and without some wish to meet with responsive feelings and efforts of obedience such a daily-working and complicated scene of goodness, ever adapting itself to provide for our wants. And surely such a keeping of the Commandments is near akin to the highest Evangelical love, for "love is the fulfilling of the law." It might seem as if it were the presiding genius of that "beloved disciple" under whose auspices some would fondly imagine our Church to have been founded, whose voice we might suppose to be still ever heard among us, still ever repeating as he was wont, and beginning and ending with appeals to love and keeping the commandments ; and reminding us of his LORD's last solemn words, "Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to "every man according as his work shall be."

PART III.

EXTERNAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CHURCH COINCIDING WITH INTERNAL CHANGES.

1. *Such mutual adaptation and concurrence the mark of design.*

IF there is any truth in the position already maintained, that the changes in our Ritual and Forms of Prayer are so much of one prevailing character as to indicate something of a Divine purpose, it appears highly probable that the peculiarities of our external condition also should coincide and harmonize with these alterations within. For such independent co-operation of unconnected means, combining to produce one effect, is considered the indication of design in an intelligent author. And if natural Theology is wont to trace out, in things physical, such internal adaptation to meet external circumstance of life, and to dwell on such as the proofs of an over-ruling Providence, may we not venture to do the same in the Church of God, provided that we conduct the inquiry with that fear and reverential mistrust with which we must ever speak of the ways of the ALMIGHTY? And surely it were not unreasonable to expect such indications of His presence; for if He who made "the plant of the field, before it was in the "earth," and "the herb of the field, before it grew," yet continues to vary its mould and texture to meet the varying influence of climate and sky, it is natural to suppose that He would do the same in that Living Tree which He has deigned to call by His own name, and of which He has represented His FATHER as the husbandman.

The first point which it was the object of this treatise to show, was that the services of our Church are characterized by a peculiar tone of sadness and humiliation; and that we are throughout made thereby to use the language of those who have fallen away from the richer inheritance and the privileges of sons. In order to point out the accommodation and harmony alluded to, it will be necessary to show that the temporal condition of the Church has been that, to which Scripture has not promised such

Apparent objections to our being supposed in a state of servitude. 67

gladness of heart, or as a Latin Collect, which our Church has omitted to retain, expresses it, "in præsenti sæculo degustare "coelestium dulcedinem gaudiorum;" on the contrary, that our external state has been that, to which it ever preaches penitential humiliation.

The second principle, which our line of argument went to establish, was that lessons of obedience have peculiarly pervaded all the alterations in our Prayer Book. Here, therefore, it will be requisite to show that, according to the analogy of God's dealings with mankind, as they are manifested by Scripture and experience, the external circumstances of the Church have been those to which the lesson of obedience is more particularly addressed, and which more especially require such admonitions.

CONSIDERED WITH REGARD TO THE FIRST POINT, OF REPENTANCE.

2. Apparent objections to our being supposed in a state of servitude.

Let us consider, in the first place, the former of these two subjects. On a cursory view, it might appear difficult to reconcile this supposition with the known history of our church and nation. For so far from our having been in a state which would be accounted one of servitude, we are met with the fact that our condition has been one, for the most part, of great apparent prosperity. It would be difficult to find a Church, where, for so long a space of time, the course of this world has been "so peaceably ordered," that its members have been allowed "to serve "the Lord in all godly quietness." The aspect which the Church bears in any country village is, in general, that of ease and respectability. Our position, as Christians and as Churchmen, has become such as to require no self-denial on our part to acknowledge our being so : indeed to such a degree is this the case, that some are almost at a loss to explain as compatible with our experience—others would explain away—that essential opposition to the Gospel which Scripture declares will exist in the world : "Ye shall be hated of all men for My name's sake" (Matt. x. 22); and "because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out "of the world, therefore the world hateth you" (St. John xv. 19) :

"if they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you" (v. 20). If, therefore, our circumstances have been, for the most part, thus signally prosperous, how then, it might be asked at first sight, can we be considered as having fallen into a less favoured condition? But, in answer to this, it will be sufficient to call to mind, that the highest privileges and richest gifts of the New Covenant are connected with sufferings from without. Such are the very mark of the true sonship; "if ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons;" "if ye be *without chastisement*, then are ye bastards and *not sons*." (Heb. xii. 7, 8.)

3. Suffering the privilege of Sons.

It will not be attempted to explain the very mysterious subject of the connection of outward circumstances with our internal spiritual condition; as serving together to make up our course of probation in the hand of our great Disposer. It may be the case after some incomprehensible manner, the bearings and extent of which our very position, as living in the world, prevents our discerning,—that as the Jewish promises, consisting in temporal blessings, were in one point of view essentially opposed to the Christian, so also the state of captivity of a Christian Church may consist of circumstances the very opposite to those of which that of the Jew consisted, as far as concerns the personal comfort and well-being of its members.

And first of all, let it be observed, that it is not merely the Christian disposition and character which has received the stamp of the blessings of the Gospel. It is often the external state and circumstances of life which are spoken of, when we should rather have expected it would be a certain temper of mind, which such circumstances might tend to foster; as for instance, "Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven." "Blessed are they that mourn:" it is the very condition of mourning which is here blessed, not as persons would now confine and explain it, they that mourn for their sins, though, of course, they more especially. "Woe unto you that are rich;" not merely ye who trust in riches. It is to certain external contingencies that the

blessing or the woe is attached, as if a resemblance to the "Man of Sorrows," though it be but in outward circumstances, brought us nearer unto Him, and was blessed on His account; as if such were modes of approach to Him, which were pervaded with that healing virtue that went out from Him.

And it may be as well to remark a little more at length, that among the privileges and blessings which the Gospel holds out to its faithful followers, those of the highest kind which speak of joy (the expression which is dropped in our Prayers), are connected with sufferings from without. Perhaps there is no place where spiritual rejoicing and gladness is spoken of but in implied or expressed connection with them. That one, for instance, of the Beatitudes, which arises as it were into the mention of "*rejoicing* and being exceeding *glad*," is, "when men shall revile you and persecute, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely." And "*rejoice* and leap for *joy*," in St. Luke, "is when men shall hate you and separate you, and cast out your name as evil." Persecution, and losing house and kindred, is made the very condition of receiving "manifold more in this present time;" a promise literally fulfilled in the early Christians, when in one verse it is said, they "sold their possessions and goods," and in the next that they "eat their meat with *gladness*," and being beaten, that "they *rejoiced* that they were counted worthy to suffer shame." And in accordance with these accounts are expressions in St. Paul's Epistles, either of rejoicing himself, or of calling others to rejoice, which are more particularly on occasions of his own or their sufferings. If he "takes *pleasure*," it is in infirmities; if he is "exceeding *joyful*," it is in all his tribulations for them; if he *rejoices*, it is "in all my sufferings for you;" and again, "if I be offered up, I *joy* and *rejoice* with you all." He deprecates the thought that he "should *glory*, save in that Cross by which the world was crucified to him, and he unto the world." It is the very condition requisite, "If we suffer with Him, we shall also reign with Him." St. Peter also makes it the very subject of their *rejoicing*, that they are made "partakers of CHRIST's sufferings."

These are not mentioned to prove the point, but as casual in-

dications on the surface of a great principle lying in the depths of Scripture. Indeed it requires a high degree of that purity of heart which is privileged to see God, consistently to keep in mind what a favoured state in God's sight that of suffering is, the last gift and dying legacy of our SAVIOUR to those who attended Him on earth. (St. John xvi. 33.) The remark that those who were afflicted with bodily maladies derived the greatest benefits from our SAVIOUR'S Presence, refers to but one manifestation of this great principle. Those who were most favoured by Him, and approached most nearly to His adorable Person, received the largest share of this His benediction of suffering; and were made "conformable unto His death," to be brought more fully to "the power of His resurrection." Their sufferings are spoken of under sacramental figures of being *baptized* with a Baptism; and *drinking of a cup*; as if from a mysterious connection with Himself, they partook of something like a Sacramental efficacy, and which, therefore, had annexed to them the promise of spiritual joy, as it was to drink of His cup, who is Himself "the well of joy." And not only the sufferings of the martyr, but even the common self-denials of daily life, are dignified and hallowed by some secret approximation to Him, and spoken of under the awful name of "bearing a cross;" as if they too were parts of that tree whose leaves are for the healing of the nations; as if, wherever the bitter waters of the desert were to be found, they partook of the virtue of that restoring and healing wood. The power of suffering even the heathen often bears witness to, in proverbs and precepts out of number, though he knew not its connection with CHRIST crucified. On the contrary, worldly prosperity narrows, we are told, the otherwise strait gate of life, even to a "needle's eye." Wonder not, therefore, that from such a state the voice of joy should be withdrawn, and the warning call to humiliation be annexed to it in the moral Providence of God: that circumstances which have the peculiar effect of blinding the eyes, should be made coextensive with monitory appeals on all sides, to walk warily and near the ground.

At all events, enough has been said to prove that if that perfect freedom which is to be found in the service of God, the

liberty wherewith CHRIST hath made us free, is the highest gift of His children ; yet we drink not fully of that Spirit of adoption without partaking also of His cup of suffering. This lowered tone, therefore, in our services, has been, according to a Christian view of the case, in entire consistency with a state of temporal prosperity. There is in this the same mutual agreement and adaptation, which is noted in things natural as manifesting Divine Providence ; as when the internal structure of animals, and the very colour of their bodies, is found to be accommodated to their modes of life, and to change also with the changes of the latter.

4. The strength of the Church in persecution.

The instances, indeed, adduced of the power of the Cross, have rather referred to individuals ; but in the Church, as a body, the same may be observed, that chastisement is the proof of love and favour, and riches a sign of danger. All the first establishment, growth, and increase of the Church, is from persecution ; like vital air and warmth drawing out and strengthening the branches. Like impulses extending, though more and more faintly, circle beyond circle, around where the Cross had moved the waters. First, the persecution which arose about St. Stephen, spreads the Church through Judea and Samaria ; then at Antioch of Pisidia, from the Jews to the Gentiles of that place ; then at Iconium, to the barbarians beyond. Throughout we see the great life-giving principle, which our SAVIOUR spoke of as arising from His Cross, " If I be lifted up, I will draw all men unto me." It is the conspiracy against St. Paul that takes him from Jerusalem to Cæsarea, to preach before kings and governors. It is the bonds of St. Paul that bear him to Rome, and are made known in the imperial palace, and are, even in Rome, to the furtherance of the Gospel. Not only to individuals is chastisement the proof of favour ; it is the Church that is like a woman in travail, " who remembereth not the anguish for joy." It is to the Churches that our LORD says, " As many as I love I rebuke and chasten." It is a Church of which He knows " the tribulation and poverty," to which He says, " Thou art rich." It is another that says of

herself, "I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of "nothing;" to which He says, Thou "knowest not that thou art "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." Awful words to those who are disposed to set the ease of an Establishment before the internal well-being of the Church, and to suppose that external prosperity is a sign of spiritual strength.

From all this it appears that a lower condition, as Christians, an humbler position, as a Church, are so far from being incompatible with the favour and protection of the world, that they mutually imply and conspire to produce each other. The latter has necessarily an enslaving and enfeebling influence, imprisoning and enchaining, imperceptibly, the free spirit of sons: whereas oppression from without has immediately the effect of putting the Church in the situation and attitude of an enemy, leaning upon her own inherent spiritual strength and weapons that are not carnal, mighty to the pulling down of strong holds; she stands immediately as an armed foe, walking upon earth, but hiding her head in Heaven. But worldly favour, on the contrary, with a subtle influence lays her asleep, and then wreathes bands about her, depriving her of the free use of her arms, closing up her eyes, binding her feet, which are no more "like hinds' feet walking on "high places."

5. Confirmed by the history of our own Church.

And these general principles will derive a forcible illustration when applied to our own Church, and the general tone and character, which has pervaded her members at different periods of her history. When she has been considered most prosperous from her union with the State, her writers have been characterized by cold and low views; and so far had their Theology taken up its station in the mere outskirts of Christian truth, that in the last age it was driven to contend for natural religion, and the existence of a God; her Sacraments were considered almost as lifeless as Jewish rites; religious controversies were engaged in on points on the very surface of Scripture, as if unconscious of the hidden depths which were below. But on occasions when persecution has begun more or less to show itself, her members

seem to be instinctively feeling after the adoption of sons. Such may be seen to have been the case in the days of Charles the Martyr, and afterwards in the Church of the Non-jurors. Among the latter, when deprived by the State, and in a condition of suffering and contempt, a new and more exalted temper was indicated by aspirations after, and sympathy with, the purer ages of Christianity; by which they seemed admitted into a more intimate union with the early Churches, and entering more fully into the high state of their spiritual adoption. An instance of this may be seen in the dying words of Bishop Ken. And this effect is the more visible by its contrast with the principles and feelings of the more numerous, and popular, and apparently flourishing Communion, that intruded. In like manner, in our own day, indications of something like persecution against the Church have been accompanied with a simultaneous movement within her, not only to fortify and repair her strong holds, to go about and mark her bulwarks, but after those higher privileges, those pleasant fields, which are hers by inheritance: as if she had begun to look out upon them from the windows of her prison-house, and to inhale their refreshing fragrance. Indeed her suffering is to be the very pledge to the Church of her beholding her true teachers: "Though the LORD give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed into a corner any more."

6. *Her feebleness and state of servitude.*

In addition to these general remarks, it might be shown more particularly, that whatever may have been our apparent prosperity, and the protection of the world, that very prosperity and protection has been in fact the captivity of the Church, as such, and of her members. Golden chains, indeed, and such as might seem rather badges of honour, and ornament; but still, in fact, chains of the SPIRIT. To come then to particulars, we have been as a Church greatly debarred from all free agency, or power of correcting, or regulating, our internal constitution. It has been the most obvious matter of reproach, that we are a "parliamentary Church;" that is to say, that we differ from other

Churches in being subject to this interference of the State. At the commencement of the period referred to, we have Henry VIII. claiming the title of Head of the Church. In whatever sense the preposterous claim is taken, it is too indicative of the position which she was to hold; and the situation, which the Prayer for the King has in the Liturgy, continues a significative memorial of her condition. In the reign of Edward VI., which, from the disposition of the King, might have been augured to be most prosperous for the Church, the second Book, which was issued with such unhappy changes, was preceded by a declaration, that if the Bishops would not take it into their consideration, he would do it himself with the aid of his parliament¹. But it is not necessary to mention the many acts of state interference, which indicate a want of freedom in the Church; nor to dwell on such points as the statute of præmunire, the suspension of Convocation, and certain circumstances in the position of our Bishops; the solemn complaint of the want of discipline which continues unrestored; the law of the land interfering with Church authority, from its affecting the rights of property; and some of these, let it be observed, not assuming the shape of persecution, but rather of protection.

All the points mentioned with respect to the Church at large, in its connection with the State, might perhaps find a parallel in many, if not most, parishes, on a small scale. Consider, for instance, the many circumstances in which the clergy feel them-

¹ Martyr, writing to Bucer, on the 10th of January, 1551, says, "Hoc non me parum recreat, quod mihi D. Chæcus indicavit; si noluerint ipsi [episcopi], ait, efficere, ut quæ mutanda sint mutantur, rex per seipsum id faciet; et cum ad parlamentum ventum fuerit, ipse summæ majestatis auctoritatem interponent." It is evident from this letter of Martyr, from a letter of Cox to Bullinger, in May, 1551, (Strype, Mem. vol. ii. part i. p. 538); and from Strype (Cran. vol. i. p. 299.) that Cranmer met with great opposition, at the end of the year 1550, from the Bishops. It is not improbable that the opposition took place in the upper house of convocation; and if this were the case, the King probably intended it to be understood that, "if driven to extremities, he would exercise his authority as head of the Church, and bring the revision of the Liturgy before parliament, without consulting the convocation any further on the subject." Preface of the Editor, p. xvii. to the two Books of Edward VI. Oxford, 1838.

selves not free to act, on account of that weight of deference which the world claims of them ; as, *e. g.*, in omitting to baptize before the congregation, and to read the Prayer for the Church militant. But the more subtle influence of the same principle may be seen in this, that clergymen, individually, do not like to rest their influence and authority on their spiritual station, as such ; they consider that their respectability depends on their liberal education, their talents, their rank in society, their worldly connections and property, which afford the whole body, and each member of it, a high respectability in the eyes of the world. But, on the contrary, there is a secret contempt entertained for their Ministerial profession as such, which they are aware is only warded off by their external advantages. Notwithstanding all that can be said of their inherent right to spiritual authority, and indeed claims to honour and veneration, as stewards of God, the highest which man can bestow, these are not met with any responsive feelings in others, nor supported in themselves by a sense of responsibility compatible with such claims, merely on account of their intimate connexion with things of an opposite character, the worldly benefits which are attached to it. The bonds of Laud, the sufferings of Ken and Wilson, not only were to themselves the means of spiritual succour, but the remembrance of them throws a hallowing light over their Order, as being thus recognized occasionally in the appropriate dress of that Master whose ambassadors they are. There is a circumstance which may serve to illustrate or characterize our present position, that it is spoken of, as if it were a principle recognized by the Church itself, which it decidedly is not¹, (although it

¹ With regard to the custom itself of turning to the East in prayer, it may be put on the same kind of footing as some other points of more or less importance, such as the use of the Cross ; of which it may be said that they are Catholic Church usages ; that our Church has retained them, by the great mercy of God, but drawn them rather into the shade on account of the abuses that have prevailed ; such has been the case even with the Eucharistic Sacrifice. In the same manner that we read of our Lord's Presence being gradually withdrawn from those unworthy of it ; but the disciples, in that retirement, came unto Him. The principles of our Church, as expressed or implied, respecting matters in dispute, may be perhaps classed in some mode of this kind :

found a place in the second Book of Edward,) that in our devotions we are to look to the people and not to the altar. What does this imply but that even in our religious worship we are to turn not to the East, the place where God has shown His countenance, but to the West ; not to the light of the ancient Church, but to the eyes of the world ; not to Angels assembled round the altar, but to the great men of our congregation ; not to the place of Paradise, our lost inheritance, but to the flock in whose hands our interest lies ; not to the Cross of Christ, but to that supposed utility which worldly wisdom suggests ; not to our Judge coming from thence, but to the judgment of the world. It is agreeable to this, that if there is any thing unbecoming or negligent in the conduct of a chief or inferior Pastor, the remedy is at hand in an appeal to the public. This is considered the

1. Things commanded and commonly observed :

Sunday Service.

2. Things commanded, and not commonly observed :

Daily Service. Reading the Prayer for the Church militant. Baptisms before the Congregation. Keeping of Fasts and Festivals.

3. Things not commanded, but implied :

Weekly Communion. Turning to the East.

4. Things not implied, but allowed :

Daily Communion.	{	e. g. On the Circumcision in Edward's second Book, the direction was, If there be a <i>Sunday</i> before the Epiphany, the same Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, shall be used. It now stands, " shall serve for every day after, &c.
------------------	---	--

5. Things not prohibited, but discouraged for fear of abuse :

Prayers for the Dead.

6. Things prohibited :

Prayers for souls in Purgatory. The Mass. Unauthorized Communion.

In the observation of these the world interferes with the Church. Now those things commanded of course a good Churchman would observe, if possible. He would also wish to restore what it implies, though it be not commanded, if fallen into disuse ; and to carry out as far as possible the spirit and intention of the Church. Catholic usages and principles he will aim at, as a Christian and a Churchman ; but in doing so will be guided by that Spirit of meek wisdom and unobtrusive reserve, which is the marked characteristic of his own Church ; and will regulate his zeal by charity, remembering the terrible woe denounced on him who shall offend one of CHRIST's little ones.

great corrector of abuses. And doubtless it is, and a very extensive and powerful one; but still it implies a very inferior condition that such should be requisite, not our singular advantage and happiness, but the sign of our captivity. "Because thou servedst not the LORD with joyfulness and gladness of heart, thou shalt serve thine enemies, and he will put a yoke of iron on thy neck." And indeed may not the popular cry for freedom from the nation at large be considered as indicative of the state of servitude, of spiritual slavery and bondage to the world? For people subjected to worldly influences feel they are not free, and conscious of this their malady, and knowing not its only remedy, which consists in the "service of God, which is perfect freedom," they loudly demand liberty. The Apostle alludes to this when he speaks of those promising liberty who are themselves the servants of sin. In like manner, forgetting the real equality of all as God's children, under the same pressure of their passions, men eagerly demand equality. Both are intimations that they want, though they know it not, the true freedom of Sons of God.

The effect of a principle is for the most part subtle and imperceptible in its operations, but exceedingly powerful. A proof of this may be seen in the circumstance that in times of any great excitement, when systems are broken up and principles set afloat, the animosity and zeal in behalf of opinions becomes such as to counterbalance every other consideration whatever; and forms bonds of union or causes of difference the most violent, from an instinctive sense which nature has given us of the power and value of principle. Slight and unimportant as the point in dispute may be, it is often of more weight than the closest external connections or apparent advantages. At the first Book of Edward, Catholic consent and doctrine were the basis of the changes, on the consideration of a vital inherent power in the Church itself, to preserve truth according to the promise of its Divine Founder. There appears at the second a great distrust of these internal promised resources; other principles were admitted. How far the admission of them has been the cause of the subsequent evils of insubordination which have been deve-

loped it may be impossible to say, or how far external control may have been necessary in consequence¹.

7. That states of servitude are Divine appointments.

But in the former agreement respecting the alterations made in the Prayers, the object was to drop all consideration of the human agents in those changes, and to turn our attention to their Providential character, as implying a Divine control and purpose. It will be necessary to do the same in the present case also,—though it is a matter of great difficulty, as secular influence and intrusion is of so much more palpable a nature as to awaken passions and feelings respecting persons, by reason of which we are less clearly able to discern the more than human Hand which is dealing with ourselves. That persons, at first, from a want of faith in the promised resources of the Church, and a dread of the power of Rome, courted the protection of the secular arm; and that others have since increased such an alliance from influences of worldly policy, by acquiescence, by com-

¹ This sort of compromise with the world, by which the Church has lost the greatness of her religious privileges, has of course been more fully developed since the time of the Non-jurors, but they from the first speak of the indications of it.

"The true notion," says Lealie, "of a Church and of a Priesthood has been utterly lost amongst those where Erastianism has prevailed, and consequently, the reverence due to religion and to God has sunk with it, and also the benefits annexed to the holy offices of the Church, as means of grace appointed by Christ our LORD, on which are grounded our hopes of mercy." (*Regal. and Pontific. vol. iii. p. 425.*)

What does this infer but that we fall thereby from the inheritance of sons? In another place he says,

"This principle of the Regale begets a secular spirit in the Clergy,—eats out the Evangelical spirit of Christian simplicity, the *παρρησία*, the open and fearless, but modest, zeal and courage in asserting the truths of the Gospel."—"This and the court air are two elements—the evangelical spirit must be very deeply rooted, if the secular do not get the ascendancy." (p. 372.)

"Erastianism," says the same writer, "has run down like a torrent from the Reformation; the Regale being then made (though very unjustly) the characteristic against Popery and fanaticism, that being supposed the only barrier against both." (p. 447.)

promise, by conciliation, and even by worse means and motives ; all these explain the mode, humanly speaking, by which these chains, laid on our spiritual strength, were formed and riveted. And the same may be said of these things, as of some of the changes in the Liturgy, that, as they arose from a want of faith, so they brought with them judicial visitations in the withdrawal of higher means of grace. But what is to be observed is, that even these judicial punishments are, in the manifold ways of Divine wisdom, the best correctives of the evil, from which they proceed, and serve also as merciful protections in that lower state out of which they arise. For, although sins are visited on children's children, in a temporal point of view, (Exod. xx. 5.) yet even those visitations may become beneficial to those children, in a spiritual sense, (Ezek. xviii. 3.) working for good to those that love God. This may be explained by a parallel instance in the Jewish history. From want of a high faith they did not cast out the old inhabitants of Canaan, and not consulting God (while His guiding voice was among them) they made a league with the Gibeonites. These Canaanites therefore continued to be "thorns in their side," but still such scourges were benefits to them, for they served, thus remaining, to try and prove them; to show "what was in their heart, whether they would serve God or no." It was the oppression of their enemies that made them from time to time feel where their only strength was, and served to raise them up a deliverer.

But, without presuming to point out any thing so mysterious as the designs of the Almighty, whose ways are as much above our ways, and His thoughts, we are told, above our thoughts, as Heaven is above earth; yet I suppose that looking to temporal governments only, without respect to the Church, it may be considered that there is some invariable rule of Providence in affording persons more or less liberty as they are able to bear it; that a tyrannical monarch, or any severe form of government is, in fact, nothing else but a certain necessary result of a people requiring such severity for their chastisement or protection. In the plague which was sent in consequence of David numbering the people, we see only, at first sight, the people visited for the

sin of the monarch, but on turning to the account in 2 Samuel xxiv. 1. we read "The anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and He moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah." We may conclude therefore, that the proverbial expression, contained in the words "delirant reges plecuntur Achivi," embraces but half the truth. For that both of these are in fact only certain effects, that the "delirant reges" is itself but a mode by which the "Achivi" are punished for their offences, or restrained from their lawlessness. That harsh rulers are set over others, humanly speaking, for their punishment, divinely, for their protection and cure; "which," says St. Basil, speaking of heavenly-imposed subjection, "a just estimator of things would not call a judgment upon them, but their benefit. "For what can be more profitable for him, who, from want of wisdom hath not in himself the power of governing, than that he should be in the power of another: that, being directed by the reason of a master, he may be like a chariot that hath obtained a charioteer, or a vessel that hath a pilot sitting at the helm." Thus, he says, was Esau made subject to Jacob; and Canaan to his brethren. And may not the same be the case with all states of worldly subjection and captivity, though we cannot ascertain its modification or extent? The effect may be as certain and invariable as the remedies which in natural things arise out of the evils that require them¹.

8. *Such best suited to the condition of the Church.*

Now, if this be the case with the kingdoms of the world, may it not be so in the kingdom of CHRIST also? Are there not in-

¹ Homer seems to allude to severe monarchs being thus a retributive mode of Providence. A tyrannical governor is imprecated as the natural consequence upon those who were wanting in affectionate loyalty to the paternal sway of Ulysses:

Μήτις ἐτι πρόφρων, ἀγανός, καὶ ἥπιος ἔστω
 Σκηπτούχος βασιλεὺς, μὴδὲ φρεσὶν αἶσμα εἰδῶς,
 Ἄλλ' αἰεὶ χαλεπός τ' εἴη, καὶ αἶσυλα ῥίζοι.
 Ὡς οὕτως μέμνηται Ὀδυσσεὺς θείοιο
 Λαῶν, οἷσιν ἀνασσει, πατὴρ δ' ὥς ἥπιος ἦεν.—Hom. *Odyss.* b. ii. 230.

deed, at first sight, obvious indications that our want of freedom is not greater than our want of internal strength to govern ourselves? Is not the suspension of the powers of Convocation acquiesced in, as perhaps a lesser evil than their revival would be? Have not the appointments of the State been, in general, no worse than those where an elective power has been exerted within the Church? Is not the usual appeal made to the public judgment, because there is not sufficient internal energy evinced to defy the world? These are not mentioned to justify or explain the case, but as some slight indications that are on the surface,—slight indications of Him whose footsteps are in the deep waters,—implying a controlling care which suits our external to our internal condition. If the power of the world has come in, not merely in open acts of aggression and interference, but, still more, by a subtle and secretly pervading influence, to actuate our conduct, may not our position be considered, in some sense, like that of the Jews, when they rejected the more immediate government of God, and requiring a King, received one in anger; by which their unruly and faithless dispositions were set under a more palpable and visible rein, in judgment, indeed, but also by a merciful provision to correct their disorders. If the first disciples, placed, as they were, in the most favoured condition as of sons, received that Spirit of adoption, and walked in that freedom, under the oppression of the world, which was at enmity with them, armed at all points with spiritual armour to encounter that enmity; may not the lowest position of a Christian be that in which there is an apparent friendship and league, when his arms are laid aside, and he receives the green withy bands as tokens of captivity; though perhaps laid asleep he perceives it not, and, from the arts of her that binds them, forgets that it is captivity at all? And indeed may there not be something in the case of an Establishment, that necessarily implies feebleness in the Church? To have “Kings for her nursing-fathers,” it has been observed, appears to denote feebleness, such as to require them; but of course it is for her sons, not for herself, that they are required.

The various fallings into, and partial recoveries from this state of servitude, are remarkable. Edward's first Book is fol-

82 *Lessons of obedience the corrective to the tendencies of the age.*

lowed by tampering with foreign Protestants, with sacrilege and confiscation ; the consequence is the second Book, by which the highest Christian privileges are in a manner curtailed and impaired. This is followed by the purgatorial and judicial sufferings of Mary's reign, and another Book ensues in some slight degree restorative. Then succeed the sufferings of the Church with Charles the Martyr ; and these are followed by the Review of the Services in 1662, still more decidedly re-instating : witness the Oblation introduced, the thanksgiving prayer, and many points of higher Church principle. After the changes of 1688, a heavier blow appears to be impending ; but, as far as the Services go, it is averted, and the Church is left to reap, in other ways, the results of a false principle. The intended alterations of the Prayer Book after the expulsion of the Non-jurors, most happily and providentially for us, did not take place : the Convocation ceases, the apparent liberty of the Church is taken away ; a course of external prosperity ensues, with a famine of the word, a slavish spirit : witness the timidity of the Church, the desertion of her colonies¹, the acquiescence in heretical Bishops.

And these instances will serve to confirm, and illustrate, the conclusion to which the former argument would lead us ; which is this, if it be the case, that, in temporal governments, for a people to seek for higher degrees of freedom, while they are unfit for them, is to contend against the wind, or to turn the course of the seasons ; so also, in the Church, the only way to obtain higher privileges, higher degrees of grace, is to show ourselves worthy of them. If we show ourselves meet to receive them, then we shall have them restored to us ; if we do not show ourselves meet to receive them, we shall not, but instead shall have our Candlestick removed.

CONSIDERED WITH REGARD TO THE SECOND POINT, OF OBEDIENCE.

9. *Lessons of obedience the corrective to the tendencies of the age.*

And now we are naturally led by these remarks to the second

¹ See Dr. Pusey's Sermons for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, p. 86.

point, which was discussed in considering the alterations in the Prayer Book, of a peculiar stress being laid upon lessons of obedience. If a peculiar adaptation to these internal changes also has existed in external circumstances, it must be as a corrective; for, of course, it is as a corrective to natural and prevailing tendencies, that the Divine Teacher lays an emphatic stress on particular instructions: such is the case in the commands delivered to the Churches in the Revelations.

In the time immediately previous to the period of our own Prayer Book, through the dark ages, it is evident that the Church had acted as such, and as counteracting the darkness of the age. Inasmuch as all the learning and ability of the times flowed into the Church, and filled all her offices, and thence emanated to the world: for, if that period was one of darkness and ignorance, she was the luminous body by which the darkness was irradiated. It is in the same manner of correction that she has operated since.

It was shown that obedience in various shapes has been very peculiarly the Divine teaching and Divine admonition, interwoven with, and infused into, our Services, speaking like the Urim and Thummim of the twelve tribes, the "light and truth on the breast" of the collective Church, or like the sacred voice in the temple, speaking to us in that way in which we are bound to be listening for the still small voice. And now it might be inferred from many points spoken of, either by implication or direct instances, in pursuing this subject of inquiry throughout the Liturgy, (in Part ii.) that this lesson of obedience has been that corrective which the spirit of the age required. But it may be again distinctly mentioned, first of all, in this, that the Religion of the age, as it has been developed both in the Church and in various forms of dissent, has in some shape or other substituted a kind of luxury of feeling, and a new doctrine respecting the Atonement for the ancient and scriptural doctrine of the Cross¹; and has shown a marked repugnance to all those principles of mortification of life and self-denying obedience, which have been considered as connected with it, and which have formed the emphatic teaching

¹ This allusion is explained in Tract No. 80, p. iii. 5.

84 Lessons of obedience the corrective to the tendencies of the age.

of our own Church. So much has this prevailed, that it has induced persons to believe that holy men of old, who spent their lives in frequent watchings and fastings and prayer, had entirely mistaken the whole nature of religion; had not only proceeded on a circuitous path, but had entirely missed the true one; and had quite mistaken the only mode of access to CHRIST. That to labour to become conformable unto His death, was in fact to forget the efficacy of it; and would serve as an evidence of having done so without some express declaration to the contrary. All this teaching is only mentioned as a fact, and as a proof of the tendencies and spirit, from whatever cause arising, of this age and nation. It may be that these distorted statements of Christian doctrine are but the shadows occasioned by the partial breaking in of the truth upon a corrupt age. Here therefore the Church has been, throughout the dangerous influences of the times, to those who would be guided by her, "a lantern unto the feet, " and a light unto our paths."

Another proof might be taken from the political principles which have characterised this country as associated with the name of liberty. It would be difficult to express them under the mildest terms, but as those of independence, of maintenance of national rights and privileges, as principles of resistance against arbitrary powers; whatever definite name and shape they assume, they immediately stand out before one as the very opposite to the peculiar tenets of the Gospel,—these are throughout, whether as shown in matters of detail or in their general spirit, directly the reverse to those principles described; from the precepts and example of Him "who learned obedience by the things "that He suffered." And although the maintainers of the political opinions alluded to would, in some measure, allow the necessity of loyal obedience, yet they would mention and dwell on cases of aggression, which would serve as exceptions. It is on this account that their opposition to the scriptural doctrine of the Cross is most apparent, inasmuch as Scripture, in expressing the duties of this kind in numberless cases of precept, example, and the like, never speaks of exceptions,—often carefully excludes them; whereas, knowing what is in man, and "looking before

"and after" for him, better than he could for himself, it necessarily would have mentioned such cases, if any exceptions had been necessary. It appears, therefore, as a very singular providential correction to all this, that there has come forth, as it were, a hand upon the wall, without a human body, to which it can be referred as its Author, and has written in distinct characters, *The lesson of obedience.*

And in the next place, the external prosperity which has been alluded to, is a reason why, according to the usual tenor of the Divine dealings, a message of warning, of humiliation, and of obedience, should be addressed. That the pride of ease and abundance, the pride of intellect and false liberty, should bespoken to in a tone of this kind is quite in harmony with Scripture; so as to afford, from the analogy, an intimation that it is the same voice which speaks to us in both. To the poor the good tidings are preached: but the commandments, and woe, and self-denial, to the rich. "Let the poor rejoice in that he is exalted, but the rich in that he is made low."

10. *Our situation a trial of obedience.*

It might moreover be pointed out, that to those who would follow this Divine guidance, and the teaching of the Church, there has been something in her condition which has had peculiarly the tendency of fostering this spirit, and affording opportunities for the exercise of it, from the very peculiarity of her position. For the circumstance of our being mixed up with the world in spiritual matters is an especial trial of our obedience to God, of our obedience to His Church as such. It is especially a discipline to, and trial of, our obedience. If our chief and subordinate ministers are in some measure thrust into, or thrust themselves into, their position over us, by a certain temporal influence, and afterwards maintain their authority by things which are of this world, such as wealth, or learning, or eloquence: And if there is a want of effectual power in the Church to remove obnoxious ministers: such a state implies a very peculiar exercise of our faithfulness to the Church of God, when her own

intrinsic claims to our allegiance are so far withdrawn from view. And in her ministers also, it is the same exercise and trial of their Christian loyalty, when the claims which the world makes upon them to compromise their higher duties are so constant and so plausible. And obedience to the Church is more particularly an act of obedience to God, when she exercises few visible indications of her approbation or censure.

That this our peculiar position is especially a trial of obedience, will be seen from a comparison, which is obviously presented to us, with various dissenting bodies. To whatever of these congregations a person may attach himself, it is evidently, throughout, the very opposite to this temper of obedience which is called into exercise ; so much so, that, in a mere moral point of view, without taking into the account the claims of the Church, one might consider this difference as the very characteristic between the Church and them. But the same argument might also be applied, in some degree, to other Churches, in comparison with our own, to show that the more visible and palpable is the authority which the Church exercises, the less is the temper of obedience towards the Church called into action. This may be forcibly seen in any single instance ; if we suppose a clergyman acting up to the many duties which the Church enjoins, but in which, from the peculiarity of her position, she does not enforce compliance ; and adhering to such as a matter of conscience : this is one of the strongest examples of allegiance to the Church, and dutiful loyalty of heart which can be presented. But such is not at all the case in a strict adherence to those points where Church authority interposes to exact the performance. But the former is so peculiarly an exercise of obedience, that no irregular pains with a flock, no appeals to piety and conscience, can instil the spirit so powerfully, or in any way without them. It appears in such cases, that instead of the visible hand of the Church, and tangible influences, instrumental in producing order and regularity, it was rather done by that secret and unseen authority, of which the many commands in the Service are instances by word expressed : in short, by imperceptible and spiritual, rather than by external and visible chains, such order is preserved. It is

ever in the still and small voice that God is heard. So quiet is the Church's teaching, ever pointing out the way to our feet; "Thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left." Besides that monitor which is lodged in the breast of each, it is our own Church, which, looking back to the early Church, and bringing down its teaching, is ever heard as a gentle voice behind us.

And now, if it be the case that there is, throughout and consistently, this peculiar and distinguishing *ἡθος* in our Church, we may expect to find the same realised in the peculiar temper of her sons, if in churches, as in nations, there prevail certain characteristic qualities, which are shown by a predominant influence of the same in their members. Something of a quiet resignation and temper of repose¹ is remarkable in those holy persons who have most closely adhered to the guiding band, and drunk most deeply the spirit of our own Church. In this point of view it would be interesting to compare them with the remarkable saints of other Churches².

¹ Witness, for instance, the dying words of Hammond and of Hooker; the works of Butler, Kettlewell, Wilson, Ken.

² There is also another point from which our Church might be looked upon, if we would see her peculiarities. It is not pleasant to institute comparisons, or it might be shown, by a contrast with other forms of Christianity, which have relinquished the guidance of primitive Worship and Ordinances, how much we have still retained in the riches of a Catholic dispensation. If our Church has in some degree exchanged "beauty for ashes," the beauty of first love for the ashes of repentance, "the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness," still is she replete with blessings peculiarly healing and restorative, according to the meek forbearance which accompanied her Master's presence of old. Observe the descent and falling away from spiritual gifts in that form of worship which is established in Scotland. Observe, instead of the consolations derived through ancient Liturgy, her cold disquisitions and dark speculations on the secret things of God; the penitential soberness which marks our Church may there be contrasted with a stern and gloomy sourness. We, when compared with primitive piety, appear to have dropped in some measure the more glad spirit of adoption, the more vivid consciousness that we are walking in the innumerable company of good angels, and the society of just men made perfect, in that city of the living God unto which we are come. Their system

11. *Our recovery of lost privileges depends on obedience.*

To all this it must be added, that if our circumstances have placed us in a position of servitude, if the height and depth of those mysterious blessings which are "hid in CHRIST," are, in some measure, withdrawn from us, as from "babes in CHRIST," we might suppose that we should have set before us the way and means of recovery, and of re-establishment as a pure branch of the Catholic Church. And now it would appear from Scripture, that it is the temper of obedience which alone will recover and realize these blessings to us; and to which also is attached the peculiar promise of strength and stability. It is "to the meek," says the Son of Sirach, "that mysteries are revealed," in distinction from "the many who are in high place and renown." (Eccl. iii. 19.) To which he adds, "Search not the things which "are above thy strength; but what is commanded thee, think "thereupon with reverence." It is this disposition, that of meekness, to which Scripture has attached the greatness of earthly promises, both as to duration, and as to the peace in this world which it is to obtain. It is reasonable to suppose that it is in the Church especially, as in the higher sense, "The land which the "LORD our God hath given us," that they are fulfilled. It is to this temper that the fifth commandment gives length of days. It is to this that the Beatitude promises the inheritance of the earth, as their peculiar portion; and the words refer us back to the Psalm from which they are taken, for the fuller explication of them, "The meek shall inherit the earth, and delight themselves "in the abundance of peace." (Ps. xxxvii. 11.) And that again

abounds in fearful terrors of bad angels; every emblem of mortality which the charnel-house can supply marks their sepulchres. Filial confidence, Christian hope, the happy Sunday, the glad sense of Resurrection, infuse no cheering spirit into their religion. It walks through the valley of the shadow of death; but not as fearing no evil from CHRIST'S presence: for the unearthly light which breaks into it reveals not blessed Angels, but shapes of dismay. We speak, let it be remembered, of the system, not of individuals, who may be of course far more acceptable in GOD'S sight than we who have higher gifts.

this promise of the multitude of peace has a peculiar reference to the Christian, is evident from a passage still higher than either, when our blessed SAVIOUR mentioned this as that point in following Him, in which we shall find rest, "Learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly, and ye shall find rest for your souls,"—that peace, doubtless, which is beyond understanding.

Here therefore, clearly, is the strength of the Church ; if she is "to enlarge the place of her tent, and to stretch forth the curtains of her habitations" into that goodly territory which God has given her in His Sacraments, it must be by this spirit of meek submission. "Ye have seen," it was said to Israel in the wilderness, and doubtless is intended of the spiritual Israel in the world, "Ye have seen how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto Myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me, above all people ; . . . ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." (Ex. xix. 5.) It is this meek obedience which is the key to the treasures of the kingdom. And it has been shown that this is the lesson, which, by a mysterious provision, has been written on "the fringes of the garments," on "the bells of the horses," "as a sign upon the hand," "as a memorial between the eyes," written, may we not say with reverence, by the finger of God ; inculcating that great Christian doctrine as the Divinely-sent preservative, and as most of all opposed to that temper which has characterized this age and nation, under various shapes and appellations of liberty. And, as the fifth commandment lays the foundation for this spirit of obedience, in the most intimate of earthly relatives, that of parents, so does *our own* Church stand in the most intimate position of spiritual relation towards us : if it be not the purest, and highest, and best, which is no question of ours (for we have not to choose, no more than we have to choose our own parents), yet the best suited by Divine Providence for our guidance and protection.

12. *Dutiful allegiance to our own Church in particular.*

THE necessity of obedience to our own Church, and consequently the security to be found therein, are to be set higher than they usually are, even by her friends ; such obedience extending to her spirit and intention (when not opposed to Scripture and the Church Catholic) as much as to points of positive command. For we are bound to obey the Church by CHRIST appointed. (St. Matt. xviii. 19.) And how does this obedience come before us individually, but by our own, while she is neither heretical nor schismatical ? We cannot help ourselves, we have no choice. Obedience, therefore, to her is obedience to God in the highest sense, as to His appointment. And therefore such obedience contains within itself somehow its own protection, has within it safety, and more than safety. When we quit her guidance in pursuit of any apparent good, we lose this security ; it is in this manner that our Church becomes to us the seat of "quietness and confidence,"

" I will lie still,
I will not stir ; lest I forsake thine arm,
And break the charm."

Or, to put the argument more particularly, we have the promise of our SAVIOUR's guidance in His Church to the end ; where are we to obtain that guidance so as to regulate our course ? In the universal agreement of a general Council. But these have been found impracticable, from the very necessity of the case ; therefore such suspension, or cessation, is the work of God, not of man. Where, therefore, is the allegiance due to such to be transferred ? God has supplied us with that which, though not even a Council, perhaps, of itself, yet, in our state of necessity, stands in the nearest place to claim that allegiance, in a Convocation. But these Convocations have been now suspended by the same Power. General Councils have been found unworthy to preserve the deposit, from the unfaithfulness or divisions of Christendom ; Convocation, from those of our own. To what, therefore, is our allegiance due ? As in the former case to the last general Coun-

cils, which were Catholic, so is it also now in our own case due to the last Convocation, and to that order of things which it has bequeathed to us in our own Liturgy. The very suspension of Convocation seems to rivet and fix the necessity of our obedience the more, for the Divine Lesson imparted thereby is, that since we are not in a state fit to regulate ourselves, we must abide by the fixed regulations of a better age. In this also are indications of the same fatherly Hand.

And, with respect to that teaching which God has supplied us with, in the very matter and structure of our forms of worship, it must be remembered that, in this Treatise, our Liturgy has been considered with respect to its weak points, its modern changes, wherein it has been our object to show, that the strength of God has been evinced even in this our weakness, that even those changes have been regulated by a Divine control. Much more, then, may it be concluded to be the case, that our strength and guidance consists in those ancient and Catholic forms themselves. To take one single instance ; the appointment of select passages from Scripture in the Epistle and Gospel. Consider how valuable this is ;—to say nothing of the harmonious union it supports with other Churches, consider how it prevents any popular religion of the day, and its peculiar doctrines, from taking up their abode in our sanctuary ; or again, how it counteracts the very evils arising from a reaction against them ; how, in short, it preserves the Catholicity of the Church. If any new Gospel were to prevail, it would endeavour to speak with the voice of Scripture, by selecting passages to suit its own purpose. But permanency and continuance is one of the chief attributes of the Church, of whom, as of her Divine Founder and Ruler, it may in some sense be said that she is “the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.” Whatever popular impulses may prevail on one side or the other, they affect her not. In her still abides the Divine presence, as the visible Shechinah in His temple of old. He continues to be her King, “be the people never so impatient ; “He sitteth between the Cherubims, be the earth never so un-
“quiet.”

13. Especially necessary at the present crisis.

And it is especially necessary, in the present day, that we should look to our own Church in this view as our divinely-appointed guardian and instructor, as light, and as, consequently, refuge. And surely we have reason to hope that a stream which has been so providentially, and, we may say, miraculously preserved, bringing down its pure baptismal waters unpolluted, will not even now be lost ; but continue to pass through the wild sea of opinions which prevail, and, as with that fabled river of old,

“*Doris amara suam non intermisceat undam,*”—

again to emerge, it may be, in a worthier and happier clime. In the meantime, through seasons of universal excitement, she administers strength and health to quiet minds. For those who reject her, amid the overflowings of ungodliness, the worst may be apprehended, whether we look to the signs of the times, or to the certainty of God's judicial visitations : “*Forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah that go softly . . . now, therefore, behold the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria,*” (Is. viii. 6, 7.) the Antichrist, we may suppose, of the mystical Babylon, whoever he may be.

To ourselves in particular the importance of the subject arises from this circumstance. That “the best things are liable to be abused,” that “the perversion of that which is best is worst,” have passed into proverbs. Into the very highest and purest things evil will accompany us : an indefinite and unreal notion of Church principles may prevail, and the spirit of “lawlessness,” with which the air is impregnated, may adopt that shape, as well as any other, from want of a deep seriousness of mind ; and a temper of irreverence may pervade it, as well as other systems, from not realizing its principles. The same longing to set foot on forbidden ground, the same itching desire to handle, and curiosity to look into, the secret things of God, the same passion *rū*

ἀπόντων, of which the heathen poet speaks¹. Ἀπροσίκτων ἐρώτων, says the same writer, ὁξύτεραι μανίαι (Nem. xi. 63), more eager are the feelings which are set on unallowed (or unattainable) objects of affection. What we want, and have mercifully supplied to us, is a plain practical guide for those whose only desire is to have sufficient light furnished them to carry them through the night in safety. And it has been shown, that such an obedient adherence to the guide afforded us is more likely to bring us to the knowledge of the very highest truths in religion than any thing else.

Had the Jews seriously attended to the indications which their Scriptures had afforded them, in speaking of mercy rather than sacrifice, and innocency more than washing of hands, they would have known the MESSIAH. In like manner it seems not unreasonable to believe that, in the Church itself, whom, as a matter of loyal obedience, we are bound to follow, there may be furnished that peculiar light, that supernatural, as it were, and gifted lamp, which should develope the things around us, so far as to render our pathway clear and safe, although not such as to gratify the curious imagination². To a speculative and anxiously-forecasting mind our course is beset with difficulties, but it must be remembered how much is said in Scripture of its promises being retained for those, who "wait for God".

¹ Ἦρατο τῶν ἀπόντων,
τῶν, ὅλα καὶ πολλοὶ πάθον.
Ἰστί δὲ φύλον ἐν ἀν-
θρώποισι ματαιώτατον,
ὅστις ἀσχόνων ἐπιχώ-
ρια, πακταίνει τὰ πόρσω,
μεταμῶνια θη-
ρέων ἀκράντοις ἐλπίσιν. Pyth. iii. 34.

Thucydides also uses a similar expression; δυσίρωτας εἶναι τῶν ἀπόντων. lib. vi. c. 13.

² "The primitive Fathers," says Bishop Wilson, "were ever modest upon religious questions . . . and carefully suppressed the curious, restless temper."
—*Sacra Privata*, Tuesday, Meditations.

One of the appointed Gospels peculiar to us, which has not been before noticed, will illustrate this our situation. On the second Sunday in Lent, that in the Roman Missal is on the Transfiguration, which thus becomes the prominent

Besides which it is especially necessary that, in upholding great and good principles, we do not forget humble duty,—the keeping of the heart, from whence are the issues of life. The extreme value and importance of principles, natural religion itself teaches us, by the earnestness instinctively shown in maintaining even the shadows of truth, however false. And Revelation confirms the same by making our salvation to depend on our belief, *i. e.*, on our acceptance of, and adherence to, certain principles. But yet the preservation and maintenance of those principles in the world at large, may be the work of God alone, so far as not to admit of human forecast or prudence, excepting as subordinate to certain definite callings and duties. To turn the attention too exclusively to certain great principles, without reference to human affections, and lower responsibilities, may imply presumptuousness in man, and be detrimental, in the highest degree, to the moral character. It were well worthy of enquiry whether there be not some grand fundamental error of this kind developed in the Church of Rome. It has had peculiarly entrusted to it the keeping of great, doctrinal, Catholic truths; and in the keeping of these it has also peculiarly stamped upon it the mark of Cain, fraternal blood. This is a wonderful phenomenon, but the temper that gives birth to it, is generally to be perceived in religious controversy, in drinking up the springs of natural affection and Christian compassion. For, although religious persecution, especially in the atrocious scenes it has given rise to, in burning

subject for the day in the Roman and Parisian Breviaries. We are thus led by them from our blessed LORD's temptation on the previous Sunday to be with Him soon in His glory and on the Mount. But instead of this we have in our own another Gospel, the subject of which is the woman of Canaan requesting to have "the crumbs that fall from the children's table." If this change (or rather difference, for our own is in the *Sarum*,) is in a beautiful and touching manner expressive of our condition, yet is it not the less so our blessedness if we act up to it; for there is scarce an instance of a higher expression of favour and acceptance than that to the poor woman, though it is after "bearing long with her," and drawing out more fully her penitential request. We are not to be on the Mount with the three favoured Apostles; but from the borders of Tyre and Sidon, we may gather up the crumbs, and fall at His feet and worship Him, and wait for Him in our need.

men for their religion, must doubtless be referred to the author of all evil, as clearly his work ; yet in this, as in other matters, it is something truly right and good, for which he substitutes a delusion of this kind, which dries up the milk of human charity. There does really exist an Angel of light, whose semblance he thus assumes. The reason doubtless is, the instinctive sense in human nature of the extreme value of truth, and of the little importance of life itself in comparison with it. But it is often better inculcated by implication, which it is when it deeply imbues the moral character, than by direct controversy¹.

14. *Difficulty of realizing sanguine hopes.*

There is also another point which renders this subject important in the way of quietness and consolation, and in keeping down

¹ One instance may be mentioned of the kind of case to which the foregoing observations may apply. To declare positively that the Pope is Antichrist, and then to act, and to call others to act on this assumption ; or, on the other hand, even to declare that Popery is in no way a developement of Antichrist, and cannot be the full developement hereafter, may, in either case be presumptuous, (although, certainly, we do not discern in it that mark of Antichrist, "that it denies the Son.") Such confident determinations may be like the declaration of the Jews, that our SAVIOUR could not be the CHRIST, as Elias had not first come ; for indeed the Baptist had himself told them that he was not Elias. Whereas, if instead of drawing these strong conclusions, and then acting upon them, they had obeyed the Baptist's injunctions, which seem to have been appeals to each person to amend his own daily life ; then would they have believed in our SAVIOUR ; then would they have arrived at that spiritual discernment of heart, which our LORD indicates to have been necessary in order that they might be able to receive it, that the Baptist was in fact Elias (St. Matt. xi. 14), in spite of speculative difficulties, and the Baptist's own declaration that in one sense, (viz., that which they intended,) he was not that Elias. This is the more necessary, for this reason, that there appears from Scripture some grounds for supposing that the worst condemnation will be connected with the greatest light ; if, therefore, we frighten ourselves from what is good in principle in the Roman Catholic faith, with the idea of Antichrist, we may forfeit and fly away from the essential saving doctrines it maintains. If, on the contrary, from the essential saving doctrines it maintains, we declare it to have no connection with Antichrist, it is possible we may unawares be furthering the cause of the great apostasy, and come in for some share of its condemnation.

excited and curious thoughts. It has been observed how much the blessings and privileges which are peculiarly those of the Gospel, and especially those of the highest value, are connected with temporal calamities, and, in many cases, depend upon them ; as, for instance, the joy and exaltation, and " the manifold more " in this present life," attached to persecution, necessarily imply persons who will persecute : the comfort of them that mourn, and the inheritance of the meek, imply cause of grief, and occasion of anger. Poverty and an ill name have the blessings of the Kingdom. Above all we have the worldly condition of the Author and Finisher of our faith, and the cloud of witnesses which attend Him and partake of His sufferings. Now all these things create a difficulty in conceiving the existence of a high state of external prosperity, and of internal well-being coincident with it, in the Church ; not sufficient to do away entirely with those expectations which good men have entertained ¹, but such as to still any unquiet anticipations respecting them. And more than this, to keep us from having our minds too much riveted and engaged in sanguine views of the Church realizing, in external appearance, the greatness of the promises made to her : the grandeur of such, the riches of the kingdom, may be throughout entirely of an internal and spiritual nature, ascertained and possessed mostly under afflictions and privations ; so that she may have to the end, like her Divine Author, " no form nor comeliness," nor, to the worldly eye, symmetry or beauty, " that we should " desire her ;" but still, under this external humiliation and contempt, her children may " see her glory ;" as St. John did that of CHRIST, or the inspired Psalmist, when he said, " Thou art " fairer than the children of men : full of grace are thy lips."

And indeed the highest expressions by which Scripture represents the blessings of God's presence in His Church, are rather those of refreshment and relief, under existing and pressing evils, than positive enjoyment independent of them, and which therefore imply the pressure of those evils, *e. g.* " For thou hast been a " strength to the poor, a strength to the needy in his distress, a refuge

¹ See Bishop Wilson's *Sacra Privata*. Friday. Penitence, ad finem.

"from the storm, a shadow from the heat, when the blast of the terrible ones is as a storm against the wall." (Isa. xxv. 4.) It is not usually observed how much the most glowing descriptions, prophetic of the Christian blessings, consist in figures of this kind, which represent good as arising out of, and perhaps existing together with, temporal evil; as, "I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water; "I will plant in the wilderness the cedar." (Isa. xli. 18, 19.) And so also with regard to all those expressions of "the wolf dwelling with the lamb," "the leopard lying down with the kid," "and the little child leading them;" "and the sucking child playing on the hole of the asp." May they not be fulfilled, not in the absence of temporal evils, but in this, that temporal evils will be rich in spiritual blessings, when accompanied by a child-like temper? It is by similar expressions out of number that our SAVIOUR designates Himself through the Prophets. "I give waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert;" and in another place, "When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee, and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee; "when thou walkest through the fire thou shalt not be burned." (Isa. xliii.) Such also are the typical figures of the Christian state, such as the Three Children singing in the fire, and Daniel alive in the den of lions. The same seems to be inferred by the numerous prophetical expressions, as in the Psalms, which speak of our SAVIOUR as suffering, not only in His own person, but likewise in His members. Those good things, therefore, which are in store for the Church, may be like most, if not all, other prophecies before they are fulfilled, entirely of a nature defying our previous suppositions; only we can see thus much, that the enjoyment of high spiritual privileges, together with temporal prosperity, appears incompatible.

It is moreover remarkable how often the word "*witness*" is applied in Scripture, either to the Church, or to the HOLY SPIRIT as within her, or to those sent by Him; as if in this point of view alone, i. e., as a witness, it had a great office to fulfil. And if the history of the ancient Church, at any place or period we take it after the earliest days, creates a feeling of disappointment,

such a sense of things ought in no way to paralyze endeavours in behalf of the holy cause of the Catholic "faith once delivered to the saints;" but should have the effect of sobering and strengthening, and, I may add, of spiritualizing our views, as looking forward rather in the hope of being ourselves with God, than of what may happen here: above all things as motives to Christian courage and Christian compassion, with respect to ourselves and the rest of mankind, and Christian reverence with respect to God. With these for our watchwords, if we act up to them, we shall never fail.

15. *The voice of warning.*

The conclusion to be deduced from the whole subject may be this. Now that we are called upon, from every quarter, to prepare ourselves for something coming on, and all things appear to portend an approaching struggle of the powers of good and evil, it appears highly desirable that, under the excitement of the day, we should not mistake the matter, but consider in what our true strength lies, namely, in repentance and obedience; and from thence, having made our peace with God, in possessing our souls in patience.

On the other hand, that we do not set too high a value on the temporal advantages of the Church, or allow them to come into competition with sacred and high principles, remembering that at such times especially, "the Refiner sits" to "purify the sons of Levi." It is He who hath told us to buy of Him "gold tried in the fire;" in distinction, we may suppose, from false worldly principles, which will not abide the day of proof; for during our prosperity, it has been indeed the case, that we have been "lukewarm, neither cold nor hot." Now through the foregoing Treatise it has been often found necessary to refer to our blessed SAVIOUR's awful warning to the Churches, in the vision of the evangelical Prophet, inasmuch as we there have His own words addressed to particular Churches, which had been brought up like our own, and established in the faith; and our object has been to ascertain, as far as we reverently may, His voice to our

own Church. It so happens that His warning to one of those Churches is very much the same as we have supposed it to be to ourselves. It were indeed presumptuous to say that the whole argument herein deduced, if true, becomes equivalent and parallel to anything so divine and holy as those sacred words of our **Lord Himself**; yet we may, I think, venture to say, that our **Lord** does in those words of Scripture speak to us, and that the subject which has been pursued, points our attention to those His words, and has the effect of laying an emphatic stress and particular application to each verse and part of it, as having a reference, in our own case, to some of the points which have been commented on. The warning is this :

“ These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true
“ Witness, the beginning of the creation of **GOD** ; I know
“ thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot : I would
“ thou wert cold or hot. So then, because thou art luke-
“ warm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of
“ my mouth. Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased
“ with goods, and have need of nothing ; and knowest not
“ that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and
“ blind, and naked : I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried
“ in the fire, that thou mayest be rich ; and white raiment,
“ that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy
“ nakedness do not appear ; and anoint thine eyes with
“ eye-salve, that thou mayest see. As many as I love, I
“ rebuke and chasten : be zealous therefore, and repent.
“ Behold, I stand at the door, and knock : If any man
“ hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him,
“ and will sup with him, and he with me. To him that
“ overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne,
“ even as I also overcame, and am set down with my
“ **FATHER** in His throne. He that hath an ear, let him
“ hear what the **SPIRIT** saith unto the Churches¹. ”

¹ Rev. iii. 14—22.

NOTE.—Some things in the foregoing pages may have been spoken of as new, of which it would be more correct to say, that original forms, to which they can be traced, are not known to the writer, but there may possibly be such; *e. g.*, the Collect for Quinquagesima Sunday has been thus spoken of, but some have observed that the language and spirit of that Collect savours of antiquity, more than of later religion. So also with regard to the appointed Sunday Lessons, it may be that their selection is not so recent as we have supposed, but that reasons for their appointment may be found in former Liturgies: see, for instance, the Sundays in Lent and the previous season in the Roman Breviary.

[SECOND EDITION.]

These Tracts are continued in Numbers, and sold at the price of 2d. for each sheet, or 7s. for 50 copies.

LONDON: PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1840.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

ON RESERVE IN COMMUNICATING RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.

PART IV.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

1. No argument adduced against the principle: history of the subject in the writer's mind.
2. Testimony of the early Church full and extensive.
3. The existence of what has been termed the *Disciplina Arcani*.
4. Indications of the principle independent of any known definite system.
5. The *Disciplina* a rule of a moral nature.
6. The whole subject connected with a great religious principle and rule of conduct.
7. Catholic mode of interpreting Scripture founded on the same.
8. High authority for this mode of Scriptural interpretation.
9. Reverence and caution observable in the Fathers.
10. Reserve in revelation not confined to God's word.
11. Origen's mode of considering the subject as moral not intellectual.

12. The same discussed at length by St. Clement of Alexandria.

13. The testimony of the Ancient Church to the doctrine of Christ Crucified.

14. The practice and principle of the Ancient Church perfectly analogous to our LORD's example.

PART V.

THE PRINCIPLE OPPOSED TO CERTAIN MODERN RELIGIOUS OPINIONS.

1. The nature of the objections which have been made.
2. On preaching the word most effectually.
3. On teaching the doctrine of the Atonement.
4. Danger in forming a plan of our own different from that of Scripture.
5. Statement of the case from plain moral principles.
6. All Scripture in perfect harmony as opposed to this modern system.
7. On eloquent preaching and delivery.
8. This peculiar system a worldly system.

PART VI.

THE SYSTEM OF THE CHURCH, ONE OF RESERVE.

1. The principle considered with reference to ourselves.
2. The holiness of God's House of Prayer.
3. Sacraments, Church Ordinances, and practices.
4. The Church realizes the kingdom in secret.
5. This Reserve the best preservative of sound Church principles.
6. Caution necessary with respect to the latent senses of Scripture.
7. Secret religious duties, conversation, and controversy.
8. Untenable objections on the ground of our present position.
9. This sacred principle more than ever needed.
10. Want of reverence now prevailing.
11. Summary of the whole subject.

PART IV.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

1. *No argument adduced against the principle : history of the subject in the writer's mind.*

THE writer made every inquiry of friends before the late Tract on this subject was published, to ascertain to what objections it was liable ; and since the publication, he has looked out with great interest for every thing that has issued against it, with the expectation of finding either arguments adduced, which would militate against the principle itself, or such as would be calculated to show that, allowing the principle to be true, it was not capable of bearing out the conclusions to which it has been applied : for, by means of such objections, the writer had hoped either, by answering and explaining them, to draw out and establish more clearly his main principle ; or else to be assisted in seeing that the case could not be proved ; under which circumstance he trusts he should be ready to acknowledge it. But to his great disappointment he has found nothing of this kind ; he is not aware of one single argument adduced that touches the question ; but much vague declamation, and strong alarms expressed, because the view interferes with certain peculiar religious opinions, or on account of some motives attributed to the writer's friends, or on other similar grounds, which in fact (even were they true) in no way affect him or this principle. That those who will not afford the subject a patient consideration should not agree with him, does in truth only confirm the argument which the writer wishes to maintain ; which is mainly this, that religious truth cannot be known without serious attention. If there is something sacred and divine in this rule of reverential forbearance it cannot be thus controverted ; nor has it in any way been put forth with any party feeling, nor will any one say it

has been treated by us in a spirit of controversy: the sole object being to know, by what means we may best arrive at truth, and promote religion in the world.

But independently of these objections, the writer has himself felt that there was much in the subject that needed explanation, and which was liable to misconstruction. He felt it at the time of publishing the former treatise, and has done so ever since. And some friendly notices, which have mentioned this, have not expressed it more strongly than he has been himself impressed with it: partly from not fully seeing how far the inferences might lead him, which were deducible from a principle that he considered as true; and partly from some of his original observations on the subject having been mislaid and lost at the time of the publication, comprising the whole of the proof from antiquity which is here given; and as the inquiry has from its very nature occasioned some unavoidable misapprehensions, perhaps he could not better explain his sentiments than by recording the history of them in his own mind.

The opinion was not at first formed from a knowledge of any system of the kind in sacred antiquity, nor from observing that the principle was so fully maintained throughout the whole of the Holy Scriptures as he has since found it to be, much less from any speculative theory adopted in the study; but from his own dealings with mankind in the care of a parish, and his observation of the conduct of others who, he thought, had most experience and good sense and singleness of heart in winning men to the truth. Much pain was occasioned him, and much injury he thought was done to the cause of the Gospel, in those who, from habit or want of consideration, acted otherwise. It appeared to him that, though his mode of proceeding was contrary to that which such persons require, yet it was according to the maxims of Scripture: and often oppressed, as we cannot but feel, while thus acting, at being considered by some almost without the pale of the Christian covenant, yet his own natural sense of right, delicacy, and even Christian expediency, and much more his notion of the Gospel itself, could never allow him to act differently; considering that in the care of himself he had more to guard against

insincere profession, and unreal systems of thought and feeling in religion than any thing else ; and that in others also he had nothing so much to seek for as true honesty and seriousness of mind, respecting a state so awful as that which Christianity represents ours to be. It appeared to him that there was no subject upon which we were so much and so earnestly cautioned throughout the Gospels as this (especially through all the Sermon on the Mount, and in our LORD's last discourses in St. John,) and that in the world at present the standard of things was so external, that there was more than ever danger of false pretension,—of an unreality, a want of thorough simplicity and seriousness, a secret looking to the world, such as would eat out the very heart of religion. Thoughts of this kind were constantly in his mind : not that he had any notion whatever of a system, or indeed of any great and extensive principle, nor even did his feelings assume any definite shape so as to support themselves by arguments and decisive reasons why his sentiments and practice were unlike those of certain others ; but he only felt that in acting otherwise in occasional instances of various kinds, he was doing violence to something sacred and to natural modesty ; and that the obloquy he was subject to he shared with those of whose fidelity he could not doubt, such as bishop Butler and bishop Wilson. And indeed when continually engaged in these and the like thoughts, he had felt inexpressibly relieved and comforted at finding those whom he could most value not only quite free from all this, but watchful against it in themselves and others. Perfectly one and of a piece with this appeared to him the uniform tendency of Holy Scripture, when viewed with a reference to this subject, as has been shown in the previous part of this treatise. And in reading the ancient writers with this view he found throughout, if they did not fully explain the whole of our LORD's conduct on this principle, yet they incidentally allowed it, and bore the fullest evidence to the opinions he has stated. So much so indeed that the doctrine, which appears new and strange to many of us in the present day, would have been one with which they were quite familiar. The inferences implied, and the practices recommended, would have been considered by the Ancient

Church as a matter of course, and this it is our present object to show.

2. Testimony of the early Church full and extensive.

But before entering on this part of the subject, which was before accidentally omitted, let us be understood in our appeal to antiquity. The principle has not been founded, as some have stated, on the primitive practice, but on Scripture alone. And our appeal to Catholic antiquity would be sufficient were it only to prove that it is not opposed to our opinion ; but so far is this from being the case, that, on the contrary, we shall find that it fully supports it in a variety of ways. We shall find scattered intimations of this kind pervade all primitive writings : but that more particularly there were two customs which embody and strongly put forth the principle. The first an external system of discipline, designated by the Latins the Discipline of the Secret, according to which they kept back in reserve the higher doctrines of our Faith until persons were rendered fit to receive them by a long previous preparation. The other an universal rule in the explanations of God's Word, which is founded on the supposition that it contains mystical meanings disclosed only unto the faithful.

To these two points therefore we would especially draw attention in our appeal to Catholic Antiquity ; first of all that not only what we have supposed respecting our Lord's concealing His Divine presence is confirmed both by the express allusions of the Fathers, but also by their adopting into the Church a mode of acting, which appears to us extraordinary, and which either took its rise from this circumstance (i. e. of Scriptural example), or was founded upon a great religious principle. Secondly, that they universally seem to suppose that there is in Holy Scripture something which is throughout analogous to what we have traced out in the history of our Lord's life, so that there is an unity of action and manner of a very remarkable kind in the two cases. They suppose that our blessed Lord is as it were, throughout the inspired writings, hiding and concealing Himself, and going about (if I may so speak reverently)

seeking to whom He may disclose Himself: that there are many things in Scripture which might appear common and ordinary accounts, relating to passing events, or words which appear to speak only of temporal wisdom; that our Lord is walking therein and concealing His divinity: in the same manner that we have supposed that in our Lord's ordinary walk and mode of life among men He very studiously and remarkably concealed His ineffable majesty under the appearance of common humanity, accompanied with great goodness. Though these two points are different yet they involve one common principle.

But when we come to produce the proof from the ancient Church that we are putting forth no new doctrine, we find it a task really very difficult, from the very abundance of the matter; the principle is thoroughly and entirely infused into their whole system; their words, their notions, their practices, thoroughly breathe of it, so as to indicate a state of thought and feeling perfectly at variance with those modern systems, whether that (improperly) called Evangelical, or the cold and barren (equally mis-called) orthodoxy of the last age; so as to show an entire and essential difference in tone and spirit. The proof is difficult, for one hardly knows how to produce it; if we were to bring forward, generally, sentiments from the Fathers which imply it, it would occupy volumes; and besides this, the testimony is so varied in its nature that it makes an attempt appear desultory. It is like attempting to describe some strong impression of the mind, which is shown in the body in every part; every limb, and every gesture may be indicative of it, and yet it may be rather expressed by the whole than by any part, and to select one, would not adequately serve the purpose. So does the principle pervade the body of the Church, appearing now in one part, and then in another; now in action, now in demeanour, now in expression, and often in all together, and yet in so subtle a manner as to defy description. The Fathers speak of it as our Lord's mode of conduct; they speak of it still more, as St. Paul's in all his teaching; they speak of it as a rule of Scripture, as a principle in morals; their practice with regard to others, and their studies, both alike imply it. There is, perhaps, not one among the Fathers with whom

one would not find, on this subject, that sympathy and understanding which it is in vain to seek for among moderns, at least, among those who are imbued with a spirit alien to the Church.

The spirit and practice of the Ancient Church is like the genuine and retiring modesty of first love in contrast with the feeble loudness and noisy display of a counterfeit, which would fain renew feelings it has lost: "with their mouth they show much love." (Ezek. xxxiii. 31.)

The instances we have to adduce, must therefore necessarily be various in their character, and may appear to allude to things in themselves distinct; one to a secret sense in Scripture, another to a moral rule of action, another to a rule of Church discipline, and another to an historical fact respecting our LORD or His Apostles. But it must be observed, that it is this very diversity which most establishes the point in question; namely, that it is a great moral and religious principle, of which these are incidental manifestations: for either of these points proved singly, might be supposed to be only the effect of imagination, or a train of circumstances that might be otherwise accounted for: but a concurrence of the whole in points, each of which is contrary to our at present received notions, can only be referred to a general principle. Besides which, this very variety opens to us a subject of exceeding interest, namely, our blessed LORD acting towards mankind through the whole of His Church, in a manner strikingly in harmony with His personal conduct in the days of His Incarnation.

*3. The existence of what has been termed the *Disciplina Arcani*.*

Now first of all with regard to the *Disciplina Arcani*: what has been said would naturally lead one to conclude that it owed its origin to a most sacred source. It seems so perfectly in accordance with all that has been noticed of our LORD's conduct, (in Tract No. 80. Part I.) that His example and mode of teaching will consistently account for its origin in a manner that nothing else will. And moreover, that alone will suggest a reason

why the principle should have become so universal, without any apparent reference to that definite system of Church discipline.

But even were we to suppose, as some have imagined, that the practice of the *Disciplina* had its origin in religious or philosophic mysteries among the heathen: even this by no means destroys our argument respecting the principle itself as a rule in religion or morals; for the very existence of those mysteries themselves remains to be accounted for. If the principle we maintain is a truth of God, and strongly stamped on His revelation, such a principle must be founded on our moral and spiritual nature, and therefore of course may be expected to be found among mankind; this would account for its existence in Egypt and early Greece. But there is great reason to believe that the pagan mysteries took their rise from something more holy than themselves. One cannot seriously reflect on Herodotus' account of Egypt, and the mysterious awe with which he forbears to speak of certain things in religion, without apprehending that there is much more in it than any system of man's invention; that amidst the extensive corruption of primitive religion which took place in that country, there still remained an indefinable fear, which could only find its correspondence in the sense handed down of the awfulness of the true God. So that at all events, were we to allow for a momentary supposition that this *Disciplina* had an heathen origin, the very existence of these pagan mysteries would serve greatly to establish the principle as a law in our moral nature.

But it has been well said, that to suppose the doctrines of the Holy Catholic Church owed their origin to the practices of heathen philosophy, is as if a person were to imagine that the sun owed its light to a reflection of the moon in the waters; and this we should be doing, if we allowed the secret discipline of the early Church to have owed its origin to any heathen custom. But the principle of reserve on which it is founded, is thoroughly consistent throughout with all the methods of revelation, and quite consistent in itself in all its extensive developments in the Church. If we grant it to be true that there are no proofs of the existence of the *Disciplina* itself before the middle or the end

of the second century, this would only prove that it might not have appeared as a definite system; it may have been wrong, as is the case of other institutions, that it should have assumed a precise form and name at all; or the circumstances of the Church preceding it may not have required it should do so, from the Christians being necessarily of a strong and marked character to be Christians at all, while the Church was herself struggling into existence. Yet had we a close and accurate account of the manner in which the Apostles dealt with individuals as we have of our Lord Himself, we might have found in them a continuation of His own mode of teaching, as there remarked by the close attention which the narrative admits of. Some indications of it are at once obvious in the Acts of the Apostles; for instance, the great danger we have supposed to accompany the revelation and acknowledgment of the Presence of God, is at once exemplified in the fate of Ananias and Sapphira, and the awful rebuke addressed to Simon Magus.

But the very obscurity which hangs about the practices of the early Church, the silence in which many things are left, seems to indicate something of this principle. How little from the Epistles of St. Paul, or any other records of the first ages, do we learn of any of the forms of discipline which the Church doubtless then observed? and afterwards the mention of the Secret Discipline seems to be often but incidental. Indeed, it is by no means evident that even Justin Martyr does not allude to it, it is well known that he applies the word *φωτισμός*¹, or illumination, to Baptism, a word afterwards used with reference to the instruction in Christian doctrine imparted at that Sacrament, and the light then bestowed. Add to which we know our Lord was for forty days conversing with His disciples of the things concerning the kingdom, of which nothing is publicly written or declared: in these things it was, as St. Peter says of the Resurrection, they were disclosed, "not unto all the people, but to certain witnesses chosen of God." We find, more-

¹ Justin's words are *καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λεῖτρον φωτισμός ὡς φωτισμένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μαθησάντων*.—*Apolog.* b. i. 61.

Clement of Alexandria says of the same word, *φωτισμός, ἡ μαθήτεια ἐκκληται ἢ τὰ κερυμμένα φανερώσασα*.—*Strom.* v. 10. 65.

over, that the heretics of the first age maintained that their doctrines were of that more sacred kind which our Lord and His Apostles had divulged to certain favoured disciples¹. Although there was no truth in these allegations, and no proof of a divine authority for the *Disciplina*, yet is it not likely that the false assumption of the former, as well as the latter system, may have taken their rise in some great truth, viz. our Lord's mode of communicating knowledge to His disciples, and a certain reserve in disclosing Himself?

Add to this the extraordinary ignorance of the heathen writers respecting Christianity, and the strong indications which all must have noticed throughout St. Paul's Epistles, that he discloses and withholds Christian knowledge and mysteries, according to the meetness of those to whom he was writing to receive them.

If intimations of these things are but faint in the first age of Christianity, yet in the next they derive the most ample confirmation throughout the works of St. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, and most of the succeeding Fathers; their mode of speaking of religion, of interpreting Scripture, always seems to imply this principle of reserve. The *Disciplina Arcani* is spoken of, not as some ecclesiastical system founded on motives of expediency, as is now often supposed, or arising from the circumstances of the times, or as merely directed towards the heathens; it is implied that this reserve is an universal principle in morals; that its assuming a strong and definite shape in the *Disciplina Arcani* is only an accidental development of it; that it is founded deep in our nature; that the system is to be traced throughout the heathen world in some shape or other, proving it to be either of divine origin or arising out of some common principle; that it has the authority of our Lord Himself and His disciples; that it was practised by our Lord, not from the immediate and necessary exigencies of the occasion, but as a great law and rule of religious wisdom; that an awful and reverential sense of His thus disclosing Himself only according to the state of man's heart is the only key to the knowledge of His ways, either in His moral providences or His more direct revelations.

¹ See Wotton's Pref. to Clem. p. oliv.

4. *Indications of the principle independent of any known definite system.*

The very silence therefore of the first ages is on this subject in our favour ; and a few passages that do allude to it, are in themselves so interesting, and so much tend to confirm the view we have taken, that we cannot withhold a fuller reference to them, though they have been already alluded to. The Author of the Epistle to Diognetus, which has been ascribed to Justin Martyr, says incidentally in the passages before spoken of, "having been myself a disciple of the Apostles, I am become a teacher of the Gentiles. The things which were delivered to me, I am the means to convey to those who are worthy, who have become disciples of the truth. For who is there that has a love for the Word, who does not seek clearly to know those things which were by the Word shown openly to the disciples, to whom He declared them, being Himself manifested to them, speaking with all freedom, not understood by the unbeliever, but conversing and explaining to the disciples. And they who were by Him esteemed faithful have become acquainted with these mysteries of the Father ¹."

This simple and undesigned but distinct allusion to the teaching of our Lord Himself is much to be observed, and seems by the mention of the disciples to carry on, and connect with the system of the Church that reserve which has been noticed in the Gospels, and serves to explain in some degree that silence, so remarkable in the New Testament, of the things concerning the Church delivered to faithful men.

The passage quoted by Mr. Keble on the subject of tradition from the bishop Hippolytus bears an undesigned testimony to this principle also at an early period. "Take care," says that holy Father, "that these things be not delivered to unbelieving and blasphemous tongues. For the danger is not inconsiderable. But impart them to serious and faithful men who wish to live holily and justly with fear. For it is not without a purpose that the blessed Paul in his exhortation to Timothy says . . . "Keep the

¹ See *Justin Martyr ad Diognetum, ad finem.*

deposit committed to thee;" and again "what thou hast heard from me by many exhortations, commit these to faithful men, &c." If therefore that blessed Saint delivered "these truths which were easily accessible to all, with religious caution, seeing by the Spirit that all have not faith; how much more shall we be in danger, if, at random and without distinction, we impart the oracles of God to profane and unworthy men¹."

This testimony not only sanctions the evidence of the preceding extract, but inculcates the same as a moral duty incumbent on teachers of the truth. We have, again, the very high authority of St. Athanasius for knowing, that the disciples themselves did observe precisely a similar caution from the beginning to that which our LORD had observed towards them, and this testimony connects this reserve of the Ancient Church by an unbroken chain with our LORD Himself.

St. Basil bears testimony also to this having been the practice of the early disciples, and that it was founded on our LORD's example. He mentions (in the 27th c. of his work on the HOLY SPIRIT) that there were "many things which they had received not from Scripture but from Apostolical tradition, communicated," he says, "in mystery and secrecy, and which their fathers had preserved in unobtrusive and modest silence, knowing rightly that this sacred reverence to mysteries was their best protection." He then alludes to the same having been the intention, when Moses allowed not the holy things in the temple to be seen by all, but kept the profane without, and admitted the more pure into the outer courts. After stating some circumstances of this kind in the law of Moses², such as the Levites set apart for sacred things, and the entering into the Holy of Holies with such circumstances of solemnity and awe; "in the same manner," he says, "the Apostles and Fathers, who prescribed the first rites of the Church, preserved the dignity of their mysteries in secrecy and silence. And even that

¹ See Part i. p. 26.

² As for instance in Numbers iv. 20, "They shall not go in to see when the holy things are covered, lest they die." And Numb. xviii. 21, 22. 37. Exod. xxx. 10. Lev. xvi.

obscurity which the Scripture makes use of is," he adds, "a species of the same reserve, rendering the understanding of its doctrines difficult of apprehension, and that for the benefit of ordinary readers."

5. The Disciplina a rule of a moral nature.

The evidence of these passages has been partly historical, and suggests the probability that the early system of reserve may have had some connection with our Lord's example and authority ; and partly as adducing the testimony of the Fathers respecting the practical wisdom of the rule. To the latter we may add the authority of Tertullian, in a passage before alluded to¹, and it is important as proving that, where he had occasion incidentally to allude to the *Disciplina*, he speaks of it as a rule of a moral nature. He strongly condemns the heretics for having no discipline whatever, or distinction observed in their assemblies and worship, even, he says, if heathen were present, they would "cast that which is holy to dogs, and pearls before swine." And this utter subversion of all discipline they called simplicity, and accused the care of the orthodox Christians as a mode of enticement." In the same passage he adds, that "discipline is an index of doctrine: they say that God ought not to be feared; therefore, every thing with them is free and open. But where is God not feared, but where He is not? and where God is not, truth is not; where there is no truth, of course there is no discipline. But where God is, there is the fear of God, which is the beginning of wisdom²."

The next person whose agreement with us we may mention is St. Chrysostom. His authority is of the more weight, as he himself was so eloquent and bold a preacher, and not a mere student; so as to prove that the practice which this reserve implies is in no way opposed to the most earnest teaching of the truth. He speaks of it frequently as a rule important to be observed in communicating religious knowledge. He mentions

¹ Tract No. 80. page 56.

² De Præscriptione Hæreticorum, p. 247.

it as his own practice (in his preface to St. Matthew). "Those that I perceive awake, and desirous to learn, I will endeavour to teach. Those that sleep and attend not, I will neither tell the difficulties nor their answers, in obedience to the Divine law: for it is written 'Give not that which is holy, to the dogs.' He speaks of this law in another place, as similar to that of human friendship, which imparts secrets only to the most intimate friends¹. "Let them attend to this," he adds, "who make a sort of triumphal show of the secrets of the Gospel, and unto all indiscriminately display the pearls and the doctrine, and who cast the holy things unto dogs and swine by useless reasonings²." He often speaks of it as St. Paul's practice; in his Commentary on the words of not casting pearls before swine, he says, "Paul intimates the same thing in saying (1 Cor. ii. 14), the natural man receiveth not the things of the SPIRIT, for they are foolishness unto him, and in many other places he speaks of a corrupt life being the cause of their not receiving the more perfect doctrines, therefore he commands us not to open our doors to them." He has much more to the same effect on the teaching of St. Paul. And not to dwell on various passages in which St. Chrysostom incidentally alludes to the principle, one may be mentioned in which he speaks clearly of the Discipline in the very connection we have supposed, as a mode of acting which had a reference to our LORD's own example. "We close the doors," he says, "before we perform the mysteries, and keep out the uninitiated; not from any weakness we apprehend in them, but because the generality are not yet sufficiently advanced to be rightly disposed towards them. It was upon this very account that He Himself said many things unto the Jews in parables, because seeing they did not perceive. For this reason also Paul hath commanded us to know how we ought to answer each individual."

In the Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, we may, of course, expect to find much on this subject; all that is requisite is to show that he considered this system, not as one

¹ This idea he has more than once, and He refers it to the expression in St. John xv. 15.

² See the whole of this Homily, 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7, and 16. Hom. vii.

intended merely for the self-defence of Christians, but as one intended for and contributing to the good of all parties, as a practical rule; and this he does most fully. In a passage more than once quoted of late years with reference to the *Disciplina*, he forbids the catechumens to communicate the knowledge which he says to those who are unprepared for it is highly injurious. He forbids those whom he is instructing to communicate to catechumens the things which were revealed to them. "If any should ask and say, What harm will there be in my being acquainted?" he adds, "They who are sick ask for wine; but if it be unseasonably afforded them, it occasions frenzy; and from this two bad consequences ensue, the sick man dies, and the physician is blamed."

In another place he speaks of the secret discipline as closely connected with our LORD's own teaching, as the example and authority on which it was formed. After speaking of the Gospel being hid from those that are lost, and saying that the God of the New as well as of the Old Testament concealed things in parables, he adds, "The sun renders blind the weak-sighted; not that it is the nature of the sun to make persons blind, but that the state of their eyes cannot bear its light. Thus it is that they whose hearts are diseased from unbelief, are not able to look upon the bright rays of Godhead. The LORD spake to those who were able to hear in parables, and those parables He explained privately to His disciples. The brightness of His glory was for those who were enlightened, the blinding for the unbelieving. These mysteries the Church now declares to one who ceases to be of the catechumens. It is not her custom to declare them to heathens. We often speak of many things covertly, that the faithful who know may understand, and others be not injured."

Origen, in like manner, speaks of the discipline then observed among Christians as a moral system, which was considered as best calculated to do good. And so far from its having any connexion with heathen practices, he speaks of it as opposed to them. Against Celsus, (p. 142,) speaking of some heathen philosopher, he proceeds: "Let us see if the Christians have not a much

wiser way of leading people to what is good and virtuous. For these ancient philosophers speak publicly, and make no discrimination of their hearers, but whosoever pleases may stand by and hear. But the Christians, as far as they are able, make a trial of the souls of those who wish to hear them; and first having privately brought their minds in tune, when they appear to have been sufficiently advanced by some evidence they have given of their desire to lead a good life, they then introduce them; and make a private distinction between those lately introduced, who have not yet received the sign of their purification, and those who, as far as in them lies, have indicated their determination to have no other principles of life but those of a Christian. And they have persons among them appointed to inquire into the lives and conduct of those who come to them, that they may prevent those who do things that are forbidden from coming into the common assembly; but those who are not such, they receive with their whole heart, and take pains daily to make them better."

And a little after, he proceeds, (p. 143,) "For we endeavour, as far as we can, that our assemblies should be formed of serious persons; and things which are especially of a divine character we then venture to bring forward in our public discourses, when we have no want of understanding hearers; but we conceal and pass over in silence things which are more deep, from an audience who are figuratively said to require milk. For thus Paul writes to the Corinthians, who were not yet sufficiently recovered in their morals from their former heathen state: "I have fed you with milk, and not with meat; for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able," &c. (1 Cor. iii. 2.) And the same Apostle, well aware of the more perfect food of the soul, and that that of new converts might be compared to milk, says, (Heb. v. 12,) "Ye are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat; for every one that useth ^{it} ~~meat~~ is unskilful in the word of righteousness, for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and ~~evil~~."

In the same book we find Celsus reflecting against the Christians, and accusing them of inconsistency, for now, says he, "they cry out to those of clean hands and a pure heart, washed from all wickedness, to come and be initiated in their sacred purification, now, on the contrary, they call on the sinner, the foolish, the childish, the miserable—he shall receive the kingdom of God." To which Origen answers, that "it is one thing to invite the sick to be healed, and another those that are healthy to the knowledge of divine things."

Much more to this effect does Origen mention respecting the system then observed in the Church; and what is very observable, he not only does occasionally fully bear testimony to our supposition that our LORD did in the days of His flesh reveal Himself only so far as men were able to bear it, but he speaks of our LORD Himself in expressions that might very well by analogy and metaphor be applied to the secret discipline he describes. In the treatise last quoted, he says, (*contra Celsum*, l. iv. p. 170,) that our SAVIOUR condescended to come down to the level of him who was unable to look upon the excessive lustre and brightness of His divinity. He became flesh and spoke in a bodily manner until such a one, having received Him as such, by little and little was lifted up by the WORD, and was able to behold His former person. For there are different forms of the WORD, according as the WORD appears to each of them who are being trained to knowledge, in accordance with their respective moral habit and spiritual advancement, and different progress in virtue. So that it is not in the manner that Celsus has supposed that our God became changed in form¹. And when He went up into an high mountain, He showed Himself to them in another form, and far transcending that which they beheld, who remained below and were not able to follow to Him to the height. For they who were below had not eyes capable of beholding the glorious and divine transfiguration of the WORD, but indeed were scarce able to comprehend such as He was among them, so that of them who could not perceive His Divine beauty it is said, "He hath no

¹ Celsus had been saying that JESUS CHRIST in becoming Man had ceased to be GOD; had become other than He was before. (ix. v.)

form nor comeliness; and when we shall see Him, there is no beauty that we should desire Him."

6. The whole subject connected with a great religious principle and rule of conduct.

From all that has been said it may, I think, be clearly seen with regard to the *Disciplina Arcani* that it could not have been a system suggested by heathen mysteries, but that it is so closely connected with Scripture, that allusions to it naturally rise out of, and again fall into Scriptural allusions, or some account of our LORD and His Apostles; so much so, as that all relating to it is perfectly consistent, and all of a piece with what they evidently considered to be the teaching of Holy Scripture. If either of them is attacked Origen seems in defending the one to pass imperceptibly into a defence of the other, as if the method of the Church and the method of Holy Scripture were one and the same, mutually implying each other; and as if the former gradually had its rise out of the latter, by means of an identity or similarity of conduct in the inspired Apostles or teachers in the early Churches; although the principle might have now assumed a more definite and marked character, from being formed into a system. And these remarks would be more fully seen were we to quote the numerous passages in which the expressions of St. Paul are cited in allusion to it, particularly by Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Besides this very high and Divine character with which Origen invests the practice, he at times refers it to a principle of natural modesty, such as nature has clearly given us in many instances for our protection. Nor is this incidental mode of connecting this system of the Church with our LORD's example at all confined to Origen, but frequent among other early writers; thus St. Augustine (in his commentaries on St. John, p. 1804, Par. edit.) speaking of where it is said that many "believed in CHRIST, but He trusted not Himself to them," says that "it is the same with the catechumens; they believe but are not admitted to the Eucharist." The practice is immediately applied as illustrating our SAVIOUR's conduct. In another passage, St.

Augustine speaks of himself as doubting how to act up to this as a known and acknowledged duty. In his Enarration on Ps. 39, (tom. iv. 439,) he applies to himself the words, "I said, I will take heed to my ways that I offend not in my tongue. I will keep my mouth as it were with a bridle while the ungodly is in my sight. I held my tongue and spake nothing : I kept silence, yea, even from good words, but it was pain and grief to me." He applies this passage to his own great difficulties and perplexities on this subject of reserve ; that on the one hand he might not offend by an undue display of holy things so contrary both to Divine and Apostolic precept. For our Lord and St. Paul, he says, held back even from those who were exceedingly eager to learn those spiritual truths which were beyond them ; and his advice to his hearer is, "Be not hastening to hear what you cannot receive, but improve in holiness that you may receive it." On the other hand, he was anxious and struggling with the difficulty arising from the opposite duty, as one "set over the Lord's household to give them their meat in due season." "Positus," he says, in hâc fluctuatione dicendi et tacendi ; periclitans ne projiciat margaritas ante porcos ; periclitans ne non eroget cibaria conservis."

If St. Augustine here speaks of this rule of reserve as a duty in individuals, Origen also speaks of it as a necessary circumstance in good men, inasmuch as the world cannot understand them. In the following passage He thus beautifully expresses it : "As the solar ray affects the countenance of him who looks to the sun, and it is not possible for any one to stand in the sun, and not himself to partake of its light ; so must we suppose that he will become a partaker of God, who shall have meditated on the law of the Divine Word, and shall have given up his mind to become acquainted with God." "I suppose that this secret is declared in Exodus, when the countenance of Moses, after he had familiarly conversed with God, was so glorified, that the children of Israel were not able stedfastly to look upon the glory of it, and on this account he who attended on God took a veil to converse with His people. Thus every soul which is given up to God, and hath entered into His truth, beyond what is known to the many, and hath partaken of His Divinity, surpasses the

comprehension of the multitude, so that it assumes a veil in order to direct inferiors, by discoursing on matters level to their comprehensions." (Selecta in Psalm. Quartum.)

7. Catholic mode of interpreting Scripture founded on this principle.

Now the characteristic of truth is consistency and coherence, and mutual adaptation and relation in its various parts and developments ; so that principles, which appear to have no immediate connexion in their origin and formation, are found when pursued to their consequences mutually to correspond with and imply each other : as cause and effect, as concave and convex in a circle, or as dependent parts of one great whole. Besides this practice of the secret discipline, there is another principle, almost, if not quite, universal in the Ancient Church, which is also equally opposed to modern opinions. I allude to that general custom among the Fathers of supposing that Scripture contains latent mysterious meaning beyond the letter, the apprehension of which is disclosed to a faithful life. And this practice, though in itself distinct, does in fact run up into that of the *Disciplina Arcani*, analogously to the way, in which miracles and parables are found to run up into each other as indications of one law. Both may be considered as a different development of the same principle. In both we have, what has been observed in the former part, "Wisdom going about seeking those that are worthy of her, to whom she may reveal her secrets." And a circumstance which particularly bears upon the present inquiry is this, that in speaking on this subject, as well as on the system we have before spoken of, ancient writers do incidentally illustrate or enforce their observations by the example of our Lord's dealing with mankind.

Now this mode of interpretation is so general in the Ancient Church that something of the kind may be considered as the characteristic difference between the interpretation of Catholic Christians and those of heretical teachers ; that the latter lower and bring down the senses of Scripture as if they were mere hu-

22 *High authority for this mode of Scriptural interpretation.*

man words, while the former consider the words of Divine truth to contain greater meanings than we can fathom ; and therefore amplify and extend their signification as if they were advancing onward, (like the interpretations and various fulfilments of prophecy,) into deeper and higher meanings, till lost in ever increasing, and at length infinite light and greatness, beyond what the limited view of man is capable of pursuing.

8. *High authority for this mode of Scriptural interpretation.*

Nor does it appear at all unreasonable beforehand—before considering it as a matter of fact, that this should be the case : I mean that the Divine Word should be in its secret range thus vast and comprehensive, as the shadow of the heavens in still and deep waters. In things natural, God has not only disclosed to us, by experience and natural light, the mode of tilling the earth and all other things necessary for the support of our animal life and human comforts, but he has also afforded us some knowledge of the heavenly bodies ; He has withdrawn the veil and opened something of the mysterious vastness, and ways, and order of things celestial. And in disclosing these, there is of course some great design of His Providence towards men ; whether to humble them by showing something of the vastness of His power, or to raise and spiritualize their minds by the contemplation of it. Why, therefore, may He not in like manner in His word, besides that knowledge and practical wisdom, information, and warning, which is more in the letter of Holy Scripture as a lantern unto our feet—why may there not be also concealed and laid up something of the vastness and infinity of His counsels, things Divine and spiritual, which He may also open and reveal to men to carry on the purposes of His wisdom, and of their probation ? In attempting too far to dive into it, to illustrate and apprehend its meanings, fallible men may of course greatly err from time to time, though the general principle on which they set out may be nevertheless from the SPIRIT of truth. Thus fallible men have erred and do err in their attempts to explain the heavenly bodies ; and yet they may be right in the notion of the order and the vastness of the material heavens, though wrong in their parti-

cular explanations; and if they have erred, it has been in the littleness and unworthiness of their conceptions; the higher their conceptions have been, the more have they approached to the sublimity and infinity of God's works.

But it might be said, that this mode of interpretation has arisen from the nature of the Hebrew language, in which each word contains many deep and ulterior meanings, which may be considered as types of each other. But this observation will, in fact, lead us to the same conclusion of its Divine character; it is indeed only going further into the subject, sending us back one step more in tracing the chain which reaches from God's throne. For if the sacred language which the Almighty has chosen in order to reveal Himself to mankind is of this typical nature, it proves that such is the language of God; that in numerous analogies and resemblances, differing in time, importance, and extent, but with one drift and scope, He is used to speak to us, blending figure with word spoken.

But when we come to the matter of fact as proved by the Scriptures themselves, the principle itself must be allowed as right, whatever limitations men may prescribe to the application or use of it. It is very evident how much our blessed Lord has Himself pointed out to us these deep and latent meanings, where we could not otherwise have ventured to suppose them to exist; as, for instance, in the sign of the prophet Jonah, and the lifting up of the serpent in the wilderness. And in almost all His references to the Old Testament, our Lord has led us to seek for mines of secret information disclosed to the eye of Faith beyond the letter.

And it is to be observed that Scripture has not generally pointed out to us those instances in which an allegorical interpretation is most obvious and important, but often those in which it is less so; as if thereby, it rather suggested to us a general law, than afforded any direction respecting its limit and extent. If from our Lord's own example we pass to the writings of St. Paul, it is needless to mention the numerous striking instances in which he has unfolded to us the spiritual and high senses of the Old Testament. And passing from Apostles to Apostolical

24 *High authority for this mode of Scriptural interpretation.*

writers, we find the same system acknowledged, as it were incidentally, but almost universally. To say nothing of Barnabas's Epistle, and its peculiar character in this respect, which must have great weight as being the testimony of primitive antiquity, even though it be not apostolical, nor written by the companion of St. Paul, who has been called the great *μυσταγωγός*. Even Clement of Rome, though his Epistle does not much admit of such allusions, yet has at least one remarkable instance of the kind, where he speaks of the scarlet thread held out by the harlot Rahab, as conveying a sign of "the blood of our Lord, by which there is redemption to all who trust and hope in God."

With regard therefore to this system of interpretation, we have in many instances Divine authority for it; and beyond where we have this authority, it might be thought that we have no sanction for such applications and explanations: in which case, it would be similar to the moral principles or doctrines that are deduced from Holy Scripture, which may be said to flow more or less clearly from the Word itself, and to be supported by analogy, natural consequence, or agreement with other passages; and these to be decided by the judgment of individuals, and that natural weight of authority which we allow to be due to the opinions of great and good men. But further than this, as with regard to moral principles of doctrine, so also with respect to such particular interpretations, it is perhaps the case, (as it has been well observed,) that for some of them there may be such a concurrent testimony in early and distinct Churches as to amount to a Catholic consent, which consent would of course have the same kind of sacred authority as would attend a similar agreement with respect to doctrine.

But all that is here required to be proved is, first that such a mode of interpretation is that of the Universal Church, and secondly, that it is implied thereby that it is God's mode of dealing with mankind. And here again, as in the case of the *Disciplina*, the argument does not depend upon any vindication of the manner in which it may have been pursued in some cases. Even were it granted that the interpretations of Origen, Ambrose, and others were fanciful and untenable, as perhaps they sometimes are,

yet it cannot be supposed that they were wrong in the general principle of interpretation, but in the effort of human understanding to fathom the depths of Divine wisdom in the particular instance. There may be much beyond the letter, but it may be presumption in uninspired man to say what it is,—“Let God be true but every man a liar.” Sufficient for our purpose it is that such a method of considering Holy Writ is Catholic, not to say Apostolical and Divine.

9. Reverence and caution observable in the Fathers.

The mode in which it is spoken of by so early a writer as St. Irenæus, is important; he is condemning fanciful expositions of the parables, proving thereby that it was an error that age was liable to, and, in so doing, thoroughly acknowledges the principle in the light in which we consider it, viz., that this knowledge is not to be attained by mere natural acuteness or critical sagacity, that God is throughout the teacher, that man is to wait on and reverently to learn of Him. “Those things,” he says, “in Scripture which we cannot discover we ought to leave to God, being most fully assured that the Scriptures are perfect, for they are spoken by the Word of God and His Spirit, but we as the last and the least in His Word and in His Spirit, must need His help for the knowledge of those mysteries. And it is not to be wondered at if in things spiritual and heavenly, and which are the subjects of Revelation, this should be the case, since even in those things which are before our feet (such as are in the natural creation, which are handled and seen by us and dwell about us) many things escape our knowledge, and these we commit to God.” After mentioning some particulars of this kind in the natural world, he says, “If therefore in the natural creation some things are laid up with God, and some come to our knowledge, where is the difficulty in supposing this to be the case, in those things which we seek to know in Scripture, since all the Scriptures are spiritual, and that some things according to the grace of God we should explain, and that others should be laid up with Him. So that God should be throughout the teacher, and man throughout

should be learning of Him." "If therefore in the manner which I have mentioned we will lay up some of our questions with God, we shall persevere in maintaining our faith, and continue without danger, and find all Scripture which God has given us, to be in harmony. The parables will harmonize with things spoken openly, and things openly spoken explain the parables, and in variety of statement we shall perceive within us but a multiplicity of voices, combining together to form one accordant and harmonious melody."

This passage serves very admirably to set before us the very reverent and holy manner in which the Fathers looked on this principle of interpretation: and St. Augustine may speak for another age, in thoughts very similar, and alike expressive of the general tone of feeling in the Ancient Church on this subject. "Expect not," he says, "to hear from us those things which the Lord was then unwilling to say to His disciples, for as yet they could not bear them; but rather advance in charity, which is diffused in your hearts through the HOLY SPIRIT which is given you; that, being fervent in spirit and loving spiritual things, ye may be able to discern the spiritual light and spiritual voice which men cannot bear; not by any sign appearing unto your bodily eyes, nor by any sound which is heard by bodily ears, but by the inward sight and hearing. For that is not loved which is altogether unknown. But when that is loved which is known in howsoever small a part, then by that very love itself it is effected, that it should be better and more fully known. If therefore ye advance in charity, which the HOLY SPIRIT sheds in your heart, He will teach you all truth:" "not altogether in this life," he afterwards adds, "but so far in this life as shall be a pledge of fulness hereafter." (In Joan. Evang. Tract. xcvi. vol. iii. p. 2338.) Thus, it is well known, St. Augustine and others often speak. All imply a certain reverential sobriety to be most needful in approaching God's word, lest we obtain harm instead of benefit thereby. In another passage, the same writer has occasion to condemn, like St. Irenæus, those who otherwise attempted that knowledge. "The Evangelical Sacraments," he says, "which are signified in the sayings and actions of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, are not open to all, and some by interpreting them with too little

diligence, and too little soberness, obtain oftentimes destruction instead of safety, and error instead of the knowledge of truth." (Lib. de Div. Quæst. lxxxiii. vol. vi. p. 80.) In another place St. Augustine speaks to the same effect. "By many," he says, "and manifold obscurities and ambiguities are they deceived who read carelessly, conceiving one thing for another; but in some places they find not enough even to suggest false surmises: so obscurely do some things envelop themselves in thickest darkness. All of which, I doubt not, is a Divine provision, in order to subdue pride by labour, and to recal the intellect from its fastidiousness, to which those things generally appear mean which are easily investigated." (De Doct. Chris. lib. ii. vol. iii. p. 49.) And again, "Now no one doubts that both objects become known to us with greater delight by means of similitudes, and things that are sought for with some difficulty are discovered with more pleasure. Magnificently therefore, and healthfully for us hath the HOLY SPIRIT so adapted the sacred Scriptures, as to satisfy our hunger by passages more manifest, and by those that are more obscure to prevent fastidiousness. For generally out of those obscurities nothing is elicited but is elsewhere more plainly spoken."

10. *Reserve in revelation not confined to God's Word.*

But the principle upon which ancient writers explain Scripture they do not apply to that alone, but to all the ways of God, and frequently connect this also with our LORD's conduct. It is not Holy Writ only with them, but the visible creation also, and natural providence, and sacramental mysteries, which are the veils of Divinity, through which and by which the ALMIGHTY speaks darkly to His creatures, concealing or disclosing Himself as they are found worthy. The words, by which they speak of these, might be applied also to what has been stated of our SAVIOUR's conduct when manifested in the flesh.

Thus Chrysostom, in speaking of the Christian mysteries, applies to them words which he might at another time use of Holy Scripture, or of our LORD as seen through the veil of the flesh,

in which alone He can be discerned by a purified sense enlightened from above.

"I hear," he says, "of the body of CHRIST, the unbeliever understands this in one way, and I in another. He knows not what he sees, as children when they see a book and cannot read. He who can read will find laid up in the letters a great power, whole lives and histories. He who cannot will take it to be paper and ink. He who can read will hear a voice, and will converse with one at a distance, and again by means of letters, will speak to whom he wishes. So it is with the mysteries, the unbelieving in hearing hear not; but the believers, by the experience which they derive from the HOLY SPIRIT, see the power laid up and contained in them."

The illustration which Chrysostom here makes use of is not unlike an expression of Origen's, who, in reply to Celsus who says that he knew the Christian Religion, observes, as well as might a person conversant with the common people of Egypt, and who knew the hieroglyphical figures, say he understood the wisdom of the Egyptians.

And it may bring the analogy more closely home to us to observe, that these Catholic writers, in thus speaking, will often introduce the very expression of it being our LORD Himself who is thus manifesting Himself therein to the eye of faith; or veiling His glories from us, and withdrawing Himself from the multitude, or the thoughtless and indifferent inquirer. "Is it not the case," says St. Ambrose (on Psalm 118. tom. 1. p. 1035) "that when we think over a passage in Scripture, in vain endeavouring to find some explanation for it, while we are doubting and seeking, suddenly the most exalted doctrines seem to rise, as it were over the mountains before us, then over the hills He (*i. e.* CHRIST) appears unto us, and enlightens our minds, and pours into our understanding the knowledge of that which it had appeared difficult to comprehend. Therefore the WORD which was absent now becomes present in our minds. And again, when any thing appears to us rather obscure, the WORD is as it were withdrawn, and we long and look for His return, as of one gone away." In like manner does

Augustine speak of the same great and all-extensive principle under a new analogy, that of the visible creation. Here also is it considered that we have "the presence of a God who hideth Himself," and indications that He is desirous to disclose Himself through that language, as far as we are able to bear it; in the same manner, as through the letter of the written Scriptures we behold Him as it were through a veil. "For we behold," He says, "the ample fabric of the universe containing the earth and heavens and all things that are therein. And from the greatness and beauty of this fabric the inestimable greatness and beauty of the Framer Himself, whom although as yet we know not, yet even now we love. For inasmuch as we cannot now behold Him by the purity of our hearts, He hath not ceased to set before our eyes His works, that seeing what we can, we may love: and may be thought worthy for that love itself at some time to behold that which we see not. But in all things that He hath spoken unto us (in His written Word) we must seek for the spiritual meaning, to ascertain which your desires in the name of CHRIST will assist us. By which, as by invisible hands, ye knock at the invisible gate, that invisibly it may open to us, and ye invisibly may enter in, and invisibly be healed." (Psalm 103. Enarratio.)

St. Cyril of Jerusalem carries on the same principle beyond the bounds of the visible creation, saying that in the invisible world also the Godhead is withdrawn from sight excepting so far as the SON may reveal; in a very beautiful and sublime passage¹,

¹ Catechesis, p. 48. Cat. vi. His words preceding the passage here inserted are, "But some one will say, if the nature of GOD cannot be comprehended why say so much of these things? Shall I not therefore, because I cannot draw up a whole stream, take in measure what is good for me? Because my eyes are not capable of containing the whole sun, shall I not behold as far as is needful for me? Were I to enter into a large garden, because I cannot eat of all the fruits, shall I come away hungry? I praise and glorify Him that made me, for it is His command that "every thing which hath breath shall praise the LORD." I do not now undertake to speak His praise; but were I to do it I know I should fall short of His merits: but I think it the work of piety to attempt to do what I can. And the LORD JESUS comforteth my infirmity by saying, No one hath seen GOD at any time: for although it be written that the

He intimates that not only to different states of men, in exact proportion to a certain capability of receiving it, but to all created beings and the angels of Heaven, the SON reveals the FATHER, καθ' ὃ ἕκαστος χωρεῖ. He says that "although it be written that the angels behold the face of my FATHER, which is in heaven, yet even they see Him not as He is GOD, but only so far as they are capable of beholding Him. For JESUS Himself hath told us, 'No one hath seen the FATHER, but He who is of GOD, He hath seen the FATHER.' Angels therefore behold as far as they can, and thrones and dominions more than they; yet see not all His Majesty; they see as far as they are able to do, and as far as for them is needful. Together with the SON the HOLY GHOST seeth also, for 'He searcheth and knoweth all things, even the deep things of GOD.' So that as the SON, so the HOLY SPIRIT also knoweth the FATHER. For no one knoweth the FATHER but the SON, and he to whom the SON shall have revealed Him. He seeth as is meet, and revealeth together with the SPIRIT and through the SPIRIT, according as each can contain GOD."

So variously and extensively, in senses so vast and sublime, do the Fathers acknowledge all the principles that we maintain, of the law by which GOD imparts the knowledge of Himself.

11. *Origen's mode of considering the subject, as moral, not intellectual.*

If again we come to Origen, who dwells so much on the latent senses of Scripture, we shall find that he speaks of them as means which he considers that GOD has of trying and teaching us, by a sort of reserve and gradual disclosure. This he takes for granted in all his commentaries: his common allusion is of higher meanings being revealed unto the perfect: the Bible is, with him, the field in which the unsearchable riches which are in CHRIST are

angels, &c. In another place, the same writer says (Catechesis ix. 75.) "that from His great love to man, GOD hath set the heavens around Him as a covering, that we may not see Him and die. For it is written (Exod. xxxiii. 20.) No man shall see My face and live."

the hidden treasure: its Divine precepts are the goodly pearls, but there is one of great price, and this is the secret knowledge of CHRIST. It is like an instrument in which the music is asleep, until it is brought out by a skilful hand, such as that of the Psalmist of Israel, when all Scripture is found in perfect harmony, at the sound of which the evil spirit flies: thus he speaks in his Commentaries. But we should do him injustice to suppose that he would consider Scripture, on that account, a sealed book to those unlearned in the school of CHRIST. In his letter to Gregory, he says, "that the chief means to enter into the secret sense of Scripture is to knock at the door by prayer." In another place, (in the Philocalia) he exhorts those who find difficulties in Scripture, not to despair, or be weary in reading. "For," he says, "as incantations have a certain natural power, so that he that understands them not yet derives something from them according to the character of the sounds, whether it be to his hurt, or the healing of his body or soul; so let him understand that more powerful than any incantations are the words of Divine Scripture¹."

With observations of this kind respecting the secret sense of Scripture, he blends in other places some references to our LORD's own teaching. Thus, in another place, speaking of the depth of wisdom contained in St. Paul's teaching, he says, "I will say nothing at present on all those things which throughout

¹ The passage thus proceeds: "For there are certain faculties of which the better part are sustained by these incantations as it were, from having within them some natural affinity: and though we do not seem to understand, yet these capabilities of good within are somehow strengthened thereby, and co-operate towards bettering our life." Afterwards, by another simile, he urges the same, "we may be assured that we often derive benefit when we are not aware of it (i. e. in reading the Bible), as if we were recommended to take some particular kind of food for bad eyes, and yet while taking it we do not perceive any improvement in our sight; but after two or three days the same food being distributed through our constitution, may afford us sensible experience of the benefit. So also be assured, with regard to the Divine Scriptures, that the mind is profited although the understanding doth not perceive the fruit from the bare reading. There are powers within, which are as it were charmed thereby, what is good is strengthened, and evil weakened and destroyed." (Philoc. p. 40.)

the Gospels are worthy of observation. Each of these passages contains much wisdom, such as is difficult of comprehension, not only to the multitude, but also to some persons of understanding, on account of the very profound meaning of the parables, which Jesus spake to those who were without: keeping the clear exposition of them for those who were more advanced in spiritual discernment, and who came to Him privately in the house. He who has perceived it, cannot but be full of admiration at the import of those expressions by which some are called those without, and others, those in the house. And again, who would not be astonished at the frequent transitions of Jesus, if he be able to follow them? how for certain discourses or actions, or in order to His own transfiguration, He went up into a mountain. And how below He healed the sick, and such as were not able to ascend to where His disciples were¹. (Contra Celsum, l. iii. p. 122.)

And in another place, (p. 139,) where he is speaking to the same effect, viz. that Jesus explained all things privately to His disciples, such as He deemed more worthy than others of Heavenly wisdom,—he remarks that “ Paul, in the account of gifts which are bestowed of God, puts wisdom in the first place, and knowledge the next in order, and faith in the third and lower place.” (1 Cor. xii. 13.) This principle, indeed, thoroughly imbues all the works of this great writer. Whatever may have been his errors, and however rash some of his speculations, yet one cannot but be impressed at the deep and broad views which he discloses to us in Scripture, although they may be such as it is beyond man to follow, and he may have erred in attempting it. Still, though we may not on some occasions approve of them in the particular, yet he leaves a general sacred impression that in Scripture we are treading on holy ground.

From his very remarkable depth of thought and extensive insight into the wonders of nature and Revelation, he seems to have arrived at a sense of human ignorance. With the same vast and comprehensive view of the ways of Providence with our own great Butler, and a similar devotional piety, he seems to

¹ Referred to in Part I. p. 9, note.

have wanted his practical sense and sobriety of judgment, and by a keen imagination to have been tempted to venture on those depths, which perhaps neither man nor angel is permitted to explore : yet, perhaps there is no writer who more constantly reminds us of the incompetency of the natural man to understand the mysteries of God. Thus, to use his own words, he says in his work against Celsus, (lib. vi. 17,) " In the 17th Psalm it is said of God, after the Hebrew manner of speaking, that '*He hath made darkness His secret place,*' to signify how unknown are worthy conceptions of God, who hath concealed Himself as it were in darkness, from those who are unable to bear the brightness of His knowledge, nor able to behold Him. Partly on account of the impurity of men's minds who are encompassed with infirmity, and partly from a natural incapability of understanding God. And to signify how few among mankind are found capable of the knowledge of God, Moses is described to have entered into the *darkness in which God was*. And again, Moses also shall approach unto God, and the rest shall not approach. And the Prophet, that he might set forth how deep are the doctrines which are concerning God, and which cannot be penetrated by them who have not that SPIRIT of GOD, which searcheth all things, even the deep things of God, hath spoken of His being " covered with the deep like as with a garment." And moreover, our SAVIOUR and LORD, the WORD of GOD, hath signified the greatness of the knowledge of the FATHER, that first of all it is worthily apprehended by Himself alone : secondly, by those whom the WORD shall illuminate with His guidance : when He says, ' No one knoweth the FATHER, but the SON, and he to whom the SON shall reveal Him.' He it is that dispelleth the darkness which the FATHER hath made His hiding place."

The same extraordinary writer in another passage opens a very sublime and valuable sentiment, by introducing the analogy of God's natural Providence to explain this law of the Scriptures, which so often wraps up mysterious wisdom in difficulties of thought or expression. [In the Philocalia, p. 5.]

" If," says he, speaking of the earnest and attentive reading of Scripture, " if, in particular places, to the unlearned there may

occur sentiments which do not seem to surpass the wisdom of man, this is nothing to be wondered at: for thus in the works of that Providence which embraces all the world, some things appear more evidently the works of Divine superintendence, but in others this forethought is so concealed, as to afford occasion for unbelief in that God who governs all things by an unspeakable contrivance and power. For the hand and design of an all-disposing Governor is not so apparent in things on the earth, as it is in the sun, and the moon, and the stars. And it is not so manifest in human contingencies, as it is in the souls and bodies of living creatures; the object and design being strongly discernible to those who trace these things, concerning the impulses, instincts, and natures of animals, and the structure of their bodies. But, as in the case of those who have once rightly perceived this Providence, their faith in that Providence is not lessened on account of things which they understand not; so neither should the just sense of that Divinity, which extends throughout the whole of Scripture, suffer any diminution in our regard, on account of our not being able, from our own weakness, to perceive the hidden lustre of its doctrines in some particular passages, where it is concealed by homely and despised phrase."

12. *The subject discussed at length by St. Clement of Alexandria.*

Nothing has been yet said of Clement of Alexandria, and indeed little of the Alexandrian school, as the object has been rather to show the general consent of the Fathers than to bring forward the agreement of any one in particular with ourselves. Nor, indeed, was the writer at all aware till he had fully drawn out this subject himself, and finished the Scripture proof, that St. Clement of Alexandria, had philosophically discussed the same at great length in the 5th and 6th books of his *Stromata*. He alludes to it as the Scriptural mode of instruction throughout, and maintains, by many curious instances, that this reserve in communicating moral and religious truth was observed by all the heathen philosophers. He speaks of sacred knowledge

progressively disclosing itself in this manner. "The violent," he says, "take the kingdom by force, offering violence not in contentious disputations, but by the persevering power of an upright life, and prayers 'without ceasing,' having worn out the stains of their former sins. To him," he says, "who walks according to the word, the first step towards discipline is the perception of his own ignorance. One who hath been ignorant, hath sought, and seeking, hath found the teacher; having found, he hath believed; and believing, hath hoped; and hoping in Him he loves Him; and loving, becomes assimilated to the object of his love; labouring to become that which he first hath loved."

In the same book (v. p. 555,) he says, that "as the generality of people are not taken by the intrinsic lustre of wisdom and justice, nor value them according to truth, but to some accidental pleasure they may derive;" "therefore by some mode of concealment, truly divine and needful for us, the purely sacred Word is laid up in the secret shrine of truth. Such the Egyptians indicated by the *adyta*, and the Hebrews signified by the veil, which they alone might enter into who were consecrated to God, who were to have their hearts circumcised from other affections on account of the love of God alone."

He then shows in numerous instances, how at all times the truth had been concealed, by enigmas, by signs and symbols, by allegories and metaphors, by dubious oracles, and to all this he applies the words of Isaiah (ch. xlv), "I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that they may know that I am the Lord;" after showing many instances in which he thinks there was secret knowledge in the laws of the Old Testament, he shows it was so in the hieroglyphics of Egypt, in many expressions of Plato, in the Pythagorean mysteries, in the Platonic and Epicurean secrets, (p. 575,) in the esoteric and exoteric doctrines of Aristotle, in the fictions of ancient poets. He says that the philosophers tried the sincerity of their hearers in their lives before they communicated divine knowledge to them. And besides, he says that, "through some sort of a veil truth itself appears greater and more venerable, like fruits which shine through water, and forms which are

half concealed. Moreover when different modes of apprehension are held forth, the ignorant is deceived, the wise only understands."

Of our own Scripture, he says in another place, (l. v. p. 557,) it is plainly declared in the Psalms, that it is written in parables: "I will open my mouth in a parable," &c. And the illustrious Apostle speaks to the same effect: "but we speak wisdom among them that are perfect, but not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, which come to naught, but we speak in a mystery the hidden wisdom of God. Which none of the princes of this world knew; for, had they known it, they would not have crucified the LORD of Glory."

He often alludes to St. Paul as observing this rule of reserve, keeping, he says, to the prophetic and truly ancient mode of concealment (as in 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7; iii. 1, 2, 3); and he shows that St. Paul has, in numerous places, spoken of its being usual in Scripture thus to veil the truth (as in Eph. iii. 3, 4, 5; Col. i. 9, 10, 11, and 25, 26, 27; 1 Cor. iii. 10; viii. 7; and where he says to the Hebrews that, *for the time*, they ought to have known, considering how long they had had the Old Testament). (v. 679.)

It is difficult to do more than barely allude to what St. Clement says on a subject which he enters into so fully. In the sixth book, he applies the same, in some degree, to our SAVIOUR's teaching: "Neither prophecy," he says, (vi. p. 676,) "nor our SAVIOUR Himself, promulgated the divine mysteries in a manner that they might be easily apprehended by all persons, but discoursed in parables. Certainly, the Apostles say concerning the LORD, 'that He spake all things in parables, and without a parable spake He not unto them,' (Matt. xiii. 34); and even in the Law and Prophets," he adds, "it was He that spake to them in parables."

He thus explains the reason of this reserve in Scripture, and continues, "For many causes, therefore, the Scripture conceals its full import. First of all, that we may be given to inquiry, and watchful in the discovery of saving words. In the next place, because it was not good for all to understand the saving truths of the HOLY GHOST, lest they should be injured thereby,

if they received otherwise what was intended for their salvation. Therefore it is, that those holy mysteries which are reserved for the elect, and for those who are from their faith judged worthy of knowledge, are concealed by parables. For such is the style of Scripture; wherefore our Lord also, being not of this world, yet came among men as if He were of this world; for He sustained the whole of (human) virtue, and was about to raise man, who had his dwelling here, to things high and spiritual, on from one world to another. Therefore, He hath made use of a metaphorical mode of Scripture, for such is a parable. A saying which is not itself the thing intended, but like it, and leading to it, and to the truth, him that understands it. Or, as some say, a mode of speech, which, by means of other objects, brings forward the thing intended with power and effect. The whole economy of God, as it exists in the Prophecies concerning our Lord, is a parable to those who did not know the truth." He then proceeds to say, that not the prophets only, but the disciples of our Lord, who preached the word after His death, used proverbs. And he afterwards adds to these observations: "For, as truth does not belong to all, it is concealed in various ways, and makes the light to arise on those only who are initiated in the mysteries of knowledge, and, on account of the love of it, seek the truth." (p. 678.)

13. *The Testimony of the Ancient Church to the doctrine of Christ crucified.*

Now, all that has been adduced from the Fathers goes to establish this point, (independently of others,) that all Divine and saving knowledge is derived by pains on the part of man, and requires a preparation of the heart; this is implied by both the two subjects which have been discussed, the systematic discipline of the reserve, and also that of the secret senses of Scripture revealed only to good men. It is implied by all their modes of speaking of it. All these things suppose some method of discipline necessary to ascertain the truth: so that the will and the understanding should both be exercised at once. "The

very method of all doctrine," says St. Augustine, "being partly most open, and partly by similitudes, in words, in deeds, in sacraments, adapted to all the instruction, and all the exercise of the soul, serves as a method of discipline for the reason. For both is the unfolding of mysteries directed to those things which are spoken most openly; and, if these were only such things as are most easily understood, truth would neither be sought for with study, nor be discovered with delight. If in the Scriptures there were no sacraments, and if in the sacraments there were not the symbols of truth, action and knowledge would not be sufficiently united. But now piety begins in fear, and is perfected in love."—(Augustine, *Lib. de Verâ Relig.* tom. i. p. 1223.)

And the whole of this subject, respecting the difficulty of arriving at Divine knowledge, will also bear upon another great and essential principle, which has been alluded to in the former treatise; although it be but one and a partial development of it, viz. that CHRIST crucified is the first doctrine taught,—the knowledge of our LORD's Divinity, the last men come to learn; that the study of the Cross of CHRIST, implying the humiliation of the natural man, leads to the living and practical sense of His Atonement; that through the humanity and sufferings of our LORD, men are brought to an union with the Godhead; that we cannot come to CHRIST but by bearing the Cross after Him, by which, as St. Bernard says, we are made to partake of that anointing which goeth forth from Him. The Fathers seem always to imply that the secrets of CHRIST's kingdom are obtained only by a consistent course of self-denying obedience; that a knowledge of these things is not conveyed by mere words, nor is a matter of excited emotion, but is a practical knowledge of the heart, obtained more and more by self-renouncing duties of prayer and the like; and thus it is, that, by the Cross of CHRIST, we are brought to Him, and led on to the knowledge of God. So that this higher degree of faith "goeth not forth but by prayer and fasting." This is often either explicitly stated, or incidentally implied by Origen and others. St. Augustine sets it forth in the following beautiful and figurative passage (in *Johan. Evan.* ii.)

He compares the world to a sea that we must cross before we can arrive at the stable shore. He says, that "God has afforded the plank or wood by which we may reach the shore, and that wood is the Cross of CHRIST. For no one can pass over this sea, unless carried on the Cross of CHRIST. One who has no eyes to see embraces this Cross; and while from afar he knows not whither he is to go, if he looses not his hold on this wood, will bear him to it." "This," he says, "I would wish to instil into your hearts, that, if you will live piously, and as a Christian cling to CHRIST in that which He has been made for us, you may arrive at Him in what He is and hath been in Himself." "It were better not to perceive in the understanding that which He is, if notwithstanding we adhere to the Cross of CHRIST, than to see Him in the understanding, and to despise the Cross of CHRIST. It were, indeed, best of all that that might be beheld to which we are going, and that he that goeth might cling to that which should bear him thither." "And this hath been the case with those who are enlightened with higher degrees of faith. They have seen the shore from afar, and, in order to arrive at it, have loosed not their hold of the Cross of CHRIST, nor despised His humility. But those little ones who cannot understand this, if they depart not from the Cross of CHRIST, His Passion, and His Resurrection, they are carried by this ship to that which they behold not; and they who behold it arrive also thither in the same ship." "And why was He crucified? because the wood of His humility was necessary for thee. Thou wert swollen with pride, and cast far away from thy country. Thy way was intercepted by the waves of this world, and thou hadst no means to pass over to thy country, unless carried by the wood. Be carried in the ship, on this wood; believe in the Crucified, and thou shalt arrive thither. He was crucified for thee, that He might teach thee humility; and because if He had come as God, He would not have been acknowledged. For He neither cometh nor goeth in that He is God, inasmuch as He is every where present, and contained by no place. What, therefore, was His coming, but His appearing as Man."

Such is the doctrine of the cross as taught by the Ancient Church, and confirmed by the according testimony of all Scripture; so far as we are able to trace a principle, which must be inconceivably vast, and incomprehensible in its nature and extent.

14. *The practice and principle of the Ancient Church perfectly analogous to our LORD's example.*

The evidence therefore of Catholic Antiquity affords the fullest and most complete confirmation, in every point of principle and detail, to all that has been said in the former treatise respecting the conduct of our LORD when seen in the flesh. And as our LORD has vouchsafed His presence to be with His Church, and the condition of that His presence is union and agreement; therefore in this concurrent acknowledgment to this principle we have again in the eyes of Faith our LORD's presence, His spiritual as before His bodily presence. There is a wonderful analogy in all God's dealings with mankind; in the conclusion of Part II. (Tract No. 80.) it was observed that a perfect parallel might be found throughout our moral nature, wherein He who is "the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" discloses Himself. The same exact parallel may now be shown as He is revealed in His Church. (And that independently of the occasional testimony which the foregoing extracts bear to the conduct of our LORD having been as we describe, in the way of historical allusion to the fact.)

First of all, as our LORD in the flesh concealed His divinity and His miracles, so did the *Disciplina Arcani* of the early Church do the same. It was that high doctrine that this system concealed, and the nature of those Sacraments, which are as it were a continued miracle in His Church.

Secondly, it appears that, as our LORD spake by parable things hard to be understood to the multitude, and explained them to His chosen disciples, so does the Catholic and Primitive mode of interpreting Scripture imply that all the Holy Word is like a parable, containing within it Divine wisdom, such as is disclosed to the faithful and good Christian.—That, if we are inclined to feel sur-

prise at our LORD's not making Himself publicly known to His enemies in His power and wisdom, the early Church suffered herself to be under the same obloquy and misinterpretation among heathens, who were singularly ignorant of the nature of Christianity.—That, as our LORD implied that there was great and increasing danger to those who knew His will, so, in a manner quite different to our modern notions, do the Ancients imply, that great danger is to be apprehended from knowing the Gospels, and not acting suitably to that knowledge.—That, as the Gospels indicate throughout that the benefit conferred on every individual was exactly according to his faith, to the effort he made to ask, or to touch the hem of our SAVIOUR's garment, so do the Fathers also teach that exactly according to the advancement in holiness of life, or the effort to advance, does CHRIST disclose the Eternal FATHER. That, as our LORD continually pointed out to natural objects, as conveying spiritual instruction and the Wisdom of GOD,—the birds as teaching filial confidence, the lilies of the field humility, the seed sown the nature of the eternal kingdom,—so do the Fathers speak of nature itself being also but a clothing, by which the ALMIGHTY was concealed from us, and revealed to those who read His works with faith. Finally, it would appear that, as the mortification of the Cross, and keeping the commandments, was our LORD's teaching to all indiscriminately, and to those who were thus brought to Him that He made known His Divinity; so the object of the *Disciplina Arcani* was to effect this purpose, to procure a preparation of the heart previous to the imparting of the highest knowledge. That such is throughout the teaching of the Fathers, that the Doctrine of the Cross is among them one of extensive meaning, containing both the humiliation of the natural man, and in conjunction with it the knowledge of our LORD's Divinity and Atonement.

PART V.

THE PRINCIPLE OPPOSED TO CERTAIN MODERN RELIGIOUS OPINIONS.

1. *The nature of the objections which have been made.*

It is very evident that the mere mention of such a principle as this subject indicates would immediately be met with the very strongest objections, before it is at all considered what is really meant by it. For let it be only suggested that Holy Scripture observes a rule of reserve, it may be answered at once by the strong and distinct contradiction, that the very word *Revelation*, directly declares the contrary; for is it not the very purpose of Scripture to communicate knowledge, not to conceal it? Does not, it may be said, its very graciousness depend on this very circumstance, that it reveals God's goodness to His creatures, sitting in darkness and the shadow of death; as well might it be said that the very object of light is to darken, of communication to conceal. And this argument, when not thus stated, might be put at great length, by adducing passages of Holy Writ which declare expressly their very object,—that its purpose is to reveal. But all these texts, thus adduced, need not be separately referred to, or answered, as the whole argument which they are brought to prove runs up into, and is contained in, this very simple statement, viz., that Scripture is a system of revelation; to imply therefore that it is a system of reserve, is at once a palpable contradiction.

And it is curious that the very texts, adduced in this mode of treating the subject, often imply or suggest all that we maintain. To refer to figurative language, it is said, does not God “deck Himself with light, like as with a garment?” Whereas this very expression conveys it; for does not a garment veil in some measure that which it clothes? is not that very light conceal-

ment? The revelations of God must ever be to mankind in one sense mysteries; whatever He makes known opens to view far more which we know not. Not light only, but the "cloud" also, is the especial emblem of the SPIRIT'S presence. "God is light," but "clouds and darkness," also "are round about Him;" "His pavilion is in dark waters, with thick clouds to cover Him." The comings and goings of our LORD are often significantly said to be with clouds; of Wisdom, that hath made her dwelling in Jacob, it is said, that she "dwells in high places, and her throne is in a cloudy pillar. She alone compasses the circuit of the heaven, and walks in the bottom of the deep¹."

In the same manner of considering the subject, which we have spoken of, it might be said, that St. Paul, a person of all others the most laborious in preaching, had no other object than that of declaring the Gospel to the world; and what did the Gospel contain of good tidings, but the Atonement? It might further be stated, (though I am not aware it has been,) that a certain *ῥαβήνεια*, or openness in confessing the truth, was the very characteristic of St. Paul; it was the very object of his prayers; and his request, that it might be that of others for him, (Eph. vi. 19. Phil. i. 20,) that this free utterance and boldness of speech might be given him. It was his boasting that he had thus spoken; he appealed to his converts that he had kept back nothing from them that it was expedient for them to know. "With great boldness to speak the truth," is one of the first gifts of the SPIRIT, as bestowed on the Apostles on the day of Pentecost; and "utterance" is numbered among the highest Christian graces². Now all this is not only granted, but also that if any thing here maintained would imply conduct different from that of the Apostle, would in any way derogate from the necessity of that *ῥαβήνεια*, it would of course be to be condemned in the strongest manner: of this there could be no doubt. It is needless to observe, that to withhold the truth from fear or false shame or pride is to be ashamed of CHRIST, to which that awful warning is denounced. Let it therefore, if necessary, be ex-

¹ Eccles. xxiv.

² 1 Cor. i. 5. 2 Cor. viii. 7.

plicitly stated that if any conduct is supposed to be here taught different from that which would have been practised by St. Paul, among inspired Apostles, by St. Chrysostom, among the Ancient Fathers, and by the earnest and single-hearted Bishop Wilson, in our own Church, such is far from being the intention of this treatise.

With regard to that mode of argument alluded to, it is evident that in this manner Holy Scripture might be quoted against itself, and a principle based on one command utterly repudiated without consideration, on account of its supposed discrepancy with another apparently opposed to it. But in such cases, it is by reconciling and explaining such apparent contradictions that we obtain the most life-giving principles contained within them, and the most important rules of conduct ; thus we derive them best and most safely. These difficulties are like the hardness of an external covering, which preserves and guards the most precious fruits of nature, and affords trouble at arriving at them. That this reserve is not incompatible with such a declaration of the truth is evident from this, that the two persons whom we should select as most remarkable for fulness and freedom of speech, St. Paul and St. Chrysostom, are equally as much so for their reserve. For the Fathers speak of its being most observable in St. Paul ; and it is evident how it marks his writings, especially when he touches on the subject of mysteries. Perhaps the most obvious passage that could be adduced, which seems at first against this supposition, is that in which St. Paul says, he "had kept back nothing that was profitable;" and it is remarkable of this text, so often quoted against us, first of all, that it was spoken to the Ephesians, to whom we know that St. Paul beyond all others revealed spiritual knowledge ; secondly, that they were not the Church at large, but the elders of Ephesus ; and, thirdly, to show how differently the ancients viewed these things, on referring to St. Chrysostom, we find he marks as emphatic the word "that was profitable, τῶν συμφερόντων ; for there were some things," he says, "which it was not expedient for them to learn ; to speak every thing would have been folly." And as to St. Chrysostom himself, he often refers to this reserve,

as an acknowledged principle, and it is observable that though he sometimes shows he is fully impressed with the secret senses of Scripture, yet in his Homilies he seldom alludes to them.

2. On preaching the word most effectually.

But with regard to that short and summary manner in which the whole subject may be got rid of by saying, that, notwithstanding all such speculative and abstract principles, it is nevertheless our duty to "preach the Word" (i. e. CHRIST Crucified) "in season, and out of season," and woe be to us, if we do it not. Doubtless it is so; a "dispensation is committed" unto us, a talent which it would be death to hide. And to this it must be said, that the principle of Reserve which we mention is so far from being in any way inconsistent with this duty, that it is but the more effectual way of fulfilling it. And this may be shown by another case very similar. It is our bounden duty to "let our light shine before men," to set a good example, that they "may see our good works:" but nevertheless it is true notwithstanding, that the great Christian rule of conduct, as the very foundation of all holiness, is that our religious actions should be in secret as much as possible. These two therefore are perfectly compatible. And unless we do act upon this latter principle, that of hiding our good works, our example will be quite empty and valueless. So also may it not be the case, that our "preaching CHRIST Crucified" may be in vain and hollow, unless it be founded on this principle of natural modesty, which we have maintained will always accompany the preaching of a good man under the teaching of God?

But without considering the subject in the light of a holy and religious principle, if we put it on the very lowest ground, why, it may be asked, in religion are all truths to be taught at once? in all other matters there is a gradual inculcation, something must be withheld, something taught first; and is not the knowledge of religion as much a matter of degrees as any human science? But we have rather treated it here in the higher point of view, in order to show that our efforts to do good will be

worse than fruitless, unless in doing so we act on this principle, to sanctify and strengthen our intentions, that the contrary mode of proceeding is not an indifferent matter, but very injurious. If any one acts on the pure love of God, there is no occasion to command this secrecy; for God will doubtless "reveal even this unto him:" and if we preach CHRIST from the highest motives there is no occasion to teach this reserve; but if we are liable to be influenced by new religious schemes, and indirect motives, we have great need of the warning.

And the fact is, that all we say is so natural, so obvious to natural modesty, if men would but seriously consider it, that those who are most opposed to all we maintain, do in themselves practise it unconsciously in other points. But when they hear of this Tract, without waiting to know what it intends, they hasten to the attack: like the hasty servant in Aristotle, ἀκούει μὲν τι τοῦ λόγου, παρακούει δὲ, and ἀκούσας μὲν, οὐκ ἐπίταγμα δὲ ἀκούσας, ὁρμῇ πρὸς τὴν τιμωρίαν¹.

It is asked with some degree of impatience, "Is not knowledge good for man?" Doubtless we have maintained it most especially by making it the very highest of all things, as a talent of exquisite work, the very jewel of great price, infinitely divine and sacred. We do not lower the doctrine of the Atonement, but heighten and exalt it, and all we say is, that it should be looked upon and spoken of with reverential holiness. If it is the name of Reserve only which is objectionable, then let the substance of this article be expressed by any other which may be found equally to serve the purpose, whether it be forbearance, or reverence, or seriousness, or religious caution, as long as the full intention of it is equally preserved.

A rule of moral and religious teaching of such a nature as this of course requires a little attention: there is no subject with which the generality of persons are so little acquainted, or which they have so little considered, as that of practical moral principles. And there often may be something in their mode of life, which peculiarly indisposes them to enter into the one now under dia-

¹ Ethics, vii. 6.

cussion. If a person has never been engaged in religious teaching, where his object has been to bring men to a serious consideration of the truth ; if he is known to look upon theology rather in a political than a religious point of view ; if he is much used to popular speaking, and the applause that accompanies it ; if he allows himself to discuss the most sacred subjects in the daily periodical ; if he has never been trained to any reverence for holy places ; if he consider Christianity as a mere popular system ; if he disparages sacraments : then of course we cannot consider such an one as an adequate and fair judge on a subject the very nature of which is opposed to his own practice ; for the discernment of every moral principle depends on conduct regulated with regard to it.

3. On teaching the doctrine of the Atonement.

But there is another reason, more pervading and deeply rooted than any of these, although in various ways connected with them, which remains to be considered. All the objections are made without reference to the case we adduce, and without attention to the arguments, on account of a previously conceived strong bias against it ; which makes it necessary that we inquire more at length into that system of the day which has claimed for itself the inmost sanctuary of religion, and at once predisposes men so strongly to be thoroughly opposed to all that we can urge. All the arguments adduced, and the principle maintained, are at once looked upon with respect to that system ; all other matters to which it applies, and all the circumstances on which it is founded, are immediately set aside as unworthy of consideration, because this system of late years and of human invention is through all its branches thoroughly opposed to it : and many, and more than are aware of it, have taken up their position in these opinions, and consider it so impregnable, that whatever opposes it must necessarily be false. The system of which I speak is characterized by these circumstances, an opinion that it is necessary to obtrude and “ bring forward *prominently and explicitly* on all occasions the doctrine of the Atonement.” This one thing it

puts in the place of all the principles held by the Church Catholic, dropping all proportion of the faith. It disparages comparatively, nay, in some cases has even blasphemed, the most blessed Sacraments. It is very jealously afraid of Church authority, of fasting and mortification being recommended, of works of holiness being insisted on, of the doctrine of the universal judgment. It is marked by an unreserved discourse on the holiest subjects. To this system all that we have said is thoroughly opposed.

Now it is evident that this system is throughout *peculiar*, in distinction from what is Catholic: by the term Catholic we of course mean a combination of both what the Universal Church and the Holy Scripture teach *conjointly*, the former as interpreting the latter. It is a plan thoroughly un-Scriptural, un-Catholic, unreal: we will therefore at once allow that this maxim of Reserve is directly opposed to it throughout, in its tone and spirit, in its tendencies and effects, in its principles and practices. Where Christians so thoroughly differ, what appeal can there be? When inspired Apostles, when even Paul and Barnabas, had a dissension and disputation between them, they were sent up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and Elders about the question, to decide the point in dispute. We appeal to Scripture and the Church¹. Now those who hold these opinions will allow that the Church Catholic holds them not. Neither does Scripture warrant them; which may be easily shown, even though we allow not the Church as its interpreter. Nor, indeed, are they grounded on Holy Scripture, but on a supposed expediency. For in fact the advocates of these opinions will not allow an unreserved appeal

¹ St. Augustine (vol. vi. p. 994) supposes the case of a person who hears CHRIST preached by an heretical preacher, and is in doubt what to do: to which Augustine answers, That CHRIST is preached openly, and on the housetops; that He has made His pavilion in the sun, that is to say, that the true doctrine of CHRIST is in the Church, which is a light to all nations; the question is whether his doctrine is that of the Catholic Church. This is precisely a case in point; and it is in this sense that the Church is "clothed with the sun," that CHRIST is as the lightning seen from the East to the West; and that with respect to those who say, "Lo He is here! or Lo He is there!" command is given, "Go not after them."

to the written WORD, but they maintain, that then only, when the HOLY SPIRIT was given, did Holy Scripture set forth the Atonement with that fulness which they require. Thus have they contrived to take a position which sets aside almost the whole of Holy Writ, including the Gospels themselves, from any appeal on this subject. In fact, this system is nothing else but a method of human device, which is able to quote a part of Scripture for its purpose. It is not according to the general tenor or the analogy of Scripture, nor is it founded or based on Scripture as its origin. They consider, like the Romanists, that they infallibly hold the truth, which must therefore be a fuller development of Scripture in a later age ; thus, in fact, do they make the Word of God of none effect through their tradition. These opinions, indeed, are grounded on nothing else but certain effects, which this system is thought to produce.

It is supposed that there is something particularly life-giving and heart-searching in these modes of teaching, which thrust forth exclusively and indiscriminately the doctrine of the ever blessed Atonement, and inculcate loudly the necessity of our dependence on the good SPIRIT of GOD : and these are so considered in distinction from those, which in connexion with them inculcate also practical duties, and the various departments of public and private religious worship. In which opinion there is indeed something true, but not so in the mode in which it is put forward and understood. There is indeed a great truth, of which these peculiar statements catch at the shadow, and it is their connexion with this great truth itself, which has caused them to be received as the whole of Religion. And perhaps many, who have appeared to themselves and others to have been embracing these popular opinions, have, in fact, by GOD's mercy thought of, and practically embraced, nothing else but that great truth itself. For that a more adequate sense of the Atonement, broader, and higher, and deeper views of the mystery which is "hid in CHRIST," is indeed the perfection of the Christian character, that which grows with its growth, and is strengthened together with it more and more, so that advancement in holiness is a continual progress in self-abasement and self-renunciation

...the doctrine of the Atonement.

...which is in God "manifested in Jesus
...And the same is the case with
...useful to name always the
...gradual perfection of
...continually increasing
...in spiritual life,
...through CHRIST
...through depen-
...sustain-
...life.—
...the worst to
...which they
...these
...is this
...on the
...to all we
...For this
...nature
...Catholic
...bringing
...highly
...to
...doc-
...for all
...which
...by
...in its
...to the
...course
...of
...false-
...which
...means
...;
...first
...of common

honesty, on repentance, on judgment to come, and without any mode of expression that excepts ourselves from that judgment ; by urging those assistances to poverty of Spirit, which Scripture recommends and the Church prescribes, such as fasting and alms, and the necessity of reverent and habitual prayer. These may be means of bringing persons to the truth as it is in JESUS CHRIST, with that awe and fear, which our LORD's own teaching and that of His Apostles would inspire ; surely above all things should we be careful not to be deceiving ourselves and others by an irreverent handling of God's most sacred consolations. For otherwise are we not going against what our LORD declared to be His own teaching ? are we not putting " new wine into old bottles," the Gospel blessings into the corruptions of the old man, of which we know the consequence ? Are we not putting " new cloth on an old garment ;" the new cloth of the Christian Church on the old garment of the Jewish legal Church ? Are we not exposing the sacred things of God committed to our charge, the secret treasures of His house, to our own great injury, and in a way to have evil effects on others also ? May not such a mode of exposing all the riches of our Christian inheritance be likened to the conduct of king Hezekiah, when he showed all his treasures to the king of Babylon, " all that is in mine house," said he, " have they seen ; there is nothing among my treasures that I have not showed them ;" and for this the sentence was declared, that to Babylon his children and his treasures should be taken. In like manner, the world will take captive those who thus lose their secret strength by a vain display ; and this is, in effect, the same as our LORD has said in those words " They will trample them under foot, and turn again and rend you."

With regard to the notion that it is necessary to " bring forward the doctrine of the Atonement on all occasions, prominently and exclusively," it is really difficult to say any thing in answer to an opinion, however popular, when one is quite at a loss to know on what grounds the opinion is maintained. Is it from its supposed effects ? pious frauds might be supported on the same principle : but let us observe these effects as they be-

come more fully developed : the fruits of the system have shown themselves in the disobedience of ministers to their ecclesiastical superiors, of individuals to their appointed ministers, of whole bodies of Christians to the Church. Is it the popularity of the opinion ? this is not a test of truth, but an argument of the contrary ; Christian truth is in itself essentially unpopular ; and even were it otherwise, what is popularity when it is opposed to Catholic antiquity ? Is it from Scripture ? we have shown that the tone and Spirit of Holy Scripture is quite opposed to it.

Do we then maintain that it is to be intentionally and designedly withdrawn from all public mention ? nothing of this kind has been ever suggested or practised by us ; this would of course be as unnatural as the other. Why should we not be content to act naturally, with the Church and Divine Scripture for our guides ? why should not a conscience exercised therein, and practised in the discernment of good and evil, be content to act as our common sense and judgment, or, if we may reverently use such words, as the HOLY SPIRIT, ever enlightening the path of obedience, dictates, without shaping our conduct into this mould ? Why should one who thus acts be thought unworthy of the Christian name ? Why should it be thought necessary to bring proof and induction, and, as it were by a stretch of charity, to obtain some indication that such an one denies not the doctrine of the Atonement ? which has been done in the case of the Fathers and Saints of old, and of Bishop Butler and others in our own Church.

It may be said, are we not saved by faith alone in CHRIST, and if so, what else have we to preach ? It may be answered by another question, was it not the very office of the Baptist to be the herald of CHRIST, and yet, so little did he publicly make a practice of declaring this, that there was a doubt whether he was not himself the CHRIST : but instead of proclaiming Him aloud, he taught Repentance, and to each individual amendment of life. The Baptist declared, "I came that He might be manifested," but how was He to be manifested, excepting, as our LORD said, that He would manifest Himself unto him that kept His commandments. Therefore the Forerunner preached repentance. When he did allude to the Atonement, in the expression of "the LAMB of GOD,"

it was secretly and obscurely, and probably only to a few chosen and favoured disciples, who themselves could not have understood the clear meaning of the allusion, to whom it must have been a dark saying. Doubtless, we are saved by faith in CHRIST alone ; but to come to know this in all its power, is the very perfection of the Christian ; not to be instilled or obtained by lifting up the voice in the street, but by obedience and penitence, so that, as each man advances in holiness of life, and comes the more to know what God is, the more does he feel himself, with the Saints of all ages, to be the chief of sinners. But as for that assurance and sensible confidence, with which it is thought necessary that the doctrine should be preached and received, it would seem as if there was scarcely any thing against the subtle effect of which we are so much guarded in Holy Scripture as this : all those who are recorded as being most approved, were remarkable for the absence of it ; as in the case of the Centurion, the Canaanitish woman, and others ; above all, of those who at the last day shall be surprised with the welcome tidings that they are accepted : on the contrary, those who are rejected shall come with that plea of confidence, because they have prophesied in CHRIST's name, and He has taught in their street, and will be condemned with emphatic words, as they that *work* iniquity ; whereby the whole stress is thrown on that single point, which those who hold these opinions are most studious to make of secondary importance, the necessity of *working* righteousness.

Surely the doctrine of the Atonement may be taught in all its fulness, on all occasions, and all seasons, more effectually, more really, and truly, according to the proportion of the faith, or the need of circumstances, without being brought out from the context of Holy Scripture into prominent and explicit mention. Did not St. James preach the Gospel most effectually under the guidance of God's good SPIRIT ? Did not St. Paul preach the Gospel to the Thessalonians, when he spoke of the day of Judgment, as well as to the Galatians, when in answer to certain Jewish prejudices, he set forth the only remission of sins to be found in the Cross of CHRIST ? May not we regulate our teaching according to the case of the persons we address, as they

did? But above all, did not our LORD preach the Gospel? did He not say to the two disciples who came from St. John the Baptist, "To the poor the Gospel is preached?" But how was it preached? We know what His preaching was; He taught the Atonement always, but never openly: He taught it always; He taught it in the Beatitudes, in the parables, in His miracles, in His commands, in His warnings, in His promises; He taught it always, but always covertly, never at all in the manner now required, but quite the opposite. And as it pervaded all our LORD's teaching; and ought to do, as we have stated, (Tract, No. 80. pp. 76, and 81,) the teaching of every good Christian; so surely it may do so in a way to be more effectually impressed on others, and to indicate its thorough reception into the character of the speaker, by one who might have even never prominently and explicitly declared it, any more than our LORD does in His own teaching. It may be impressed on others by the tone of a person's whole thoughts, by the silent instruction of his penitent and merciful demeanour, by immediate inference and implication from his sayings, by the only interpretation which his words will bear; but above all things, by the doctrine of the Sacraments ever influencing his life; He may thus ever bear about in the body the marks of the LORD JESUS, and preach CHRIST Crucified. Whereas, on the contrary, another who expressed this doctrine with all the fulness which is now required, might in all the tone of his disposition, his teaching, his whole bearing and observation, be as far from it as one who had never heard of it; and adopt this tone to the great injury of himself and others. The important thing needed consists in those preparations of the heart, which may lead men to humiliation and contrition; when this is done, He who "dwells with the humble and the contrite," will never fail to lead them to all the consolations of Religion. Let us consider the case of a friend who consulted us on a matter that afflicted his conscience, how tender and careful should we be, in such a case for fear of administering consolation too speedily, lest by so doing we check the workings of God's good SPIRIT, and heal too slightly His wounds to our friend's great detriment: and shall we do this to all indiscriminately?

But besides this, the awful name of the blessed SPIRIT, without whom we can neither think nor do any thing that is right, is, as is supposed, ever in like manner to be proclaimed as it were in the market-place, and those who do not do so, are supposed to deny His power, the power of the ever blessed SPIRIT of God, in whose Name we were baptized, Whom in the doxology we confess daily, in Whom we live and move. Let these sacred words be introduced in our teaching, as they are in Holy Scripture. But even from this we almost shrink at feeling that they have been used in an unreal manner, and "taken in vain;" for these holiest of words may be constantly used by us, when we are not at all affected and influenced by so concerning a doctrine, which may be seen by the whole of our character in daily life, and tone of our teaching; by self-confidence, and an absence of that fear and trembling, which ever follows the consciousness, that it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do. And what is done in such a case? Is the effect merely nugatory? Surely not: great injury is done by this irreverence to that most sacred Name. There is far less chance of real repentance in such a case.

Surely this great and life-giving doctrine might be taught more truly by one who practised no obtrusive system of this sort; to say nothing of his practical instructions, every word of which might be calculated to teach a person dependence on God; but even by his silence. For instance, might not one like holy Simeon, (whom sacred Scripture has so strongly marked as one under the gracious guidance of the good SPIRIT, by the expression, thrice repeated, that "the HOLY SPIRIT was upon him," that it was "revealed unto him of the HOLY SPIRIT," that "he came by the SPIRIT into the temple;") might not such a one, by daily frequenting "the House of Prayer," with that earnestness and assiduity which showed that he felt himself unable to stand for a day without assistance from above, learn and teach so affecting a truth, as well as by set declarations concerning it? Might he not, by these habitual practices, be rendered meet to find CHRIST in His Temple, and to prophesy in His name?

4. *Danger in forming a plan of our own different from that of Scripture.*

Surely we know not what we do, when we venture to make a scheme and system of our own respecting the revelations of God. His ways are so vast and mysterious, that there may be some great presumption in our taking one truth, and forming around it a scheme from notions of our own. It may not be the way to arrive at even that truth ; and also it may counteract some others, which it is equally important that we should be impressed with. The very idea of forming such a scheme, arises from a want of a due sense of the depth and vastness of the Divine counsels, as if we could comprehend them. It is with states of society as with individuals ; those whose thoughts and knowledge are most superficial, are most apt to systematize ; and it is very little considered what awful things in the economy of God may be thus habitually kept out of sight,—kept out of sight, perhaps, by many quite unconsciously ; for the secret influence of these opinions is more extensive than they are aware of, who are subject to them. It is not an uncommon thing to hear sermons which are throughout specious and plausible, which seem at first sight Scriptural, and are received as such without hesitation, and yet, on a little consideration, it will appear that they are but partial views of the truth, that they are quite inconsistent with the much forgotten doctrine of a future judgment. What effect, therefore, must this system have upon an age and whole nation ?

Nor is it only in its not supporting the analogy of the faith, that this system is opposed to Scripture ; but its spirit and mode of teaching is quite different. It may be observed in this, that this scheme puts knowledge first, and obedience afterwards : let this doctrine, they say, be received, and good works will necessarily follow. Holy Scripture throughout adopts the opposite course ¹.

¹ One instance in Scripture has been applied otherwise, " Make the tree good and his fruit good ; or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt ;" but this passage bears quite a different meaning ; the obvious purport being, that hypocritical, bad actions, like those of the Pharisees, flowed from a bad principle

In many and extensive senses, the language it adopts, and the plan it pursues, is on the principle that "the law is the schoolmaster, to bring us to CHRIST;" "that he who will do the will shall know of the doctrine;" whereas this teaching is, "receive only this doctrine, and you will do the will." The kind of secondary way, and as it were in the back ground, in which the necessity of obedience is put in this system, is the very opposite to Scriptural teaching. Scripture ever introduces the warning clause, "If ye keep the commandments;" they, on the contrary, "If ye do not think of them too much."

And again, is there not an extraordinary confusion and perplexity raised, which has the effect of entangling men's minds with words and phrases? Are there not frequently logical fallacies, couched in verbal inaccuracies, which will appear, on a little consideration, to be mere confusions of expression, yet ever leave a false impression? Christian repentance is spoken of as something not only separate from, but opposed to CHRIST. The effect of Christian good works is treated as having a tendency to puff us up with pride and selfishness: works, that is of humility and charity, exercised in secret, purely with the desire of pleasing God, for of course such only are good works which could be insisted on (though of course what they mean must be bad works, those of hypocrisy). Or again, that religious services weaken our dependence on the good SPIRIT; or, in other words, that frequent and constant prayers to God for His assistance, diminish our reliance on God. Or again, that the deep and awful sense of judgment to come derogates from CHRIST's atonement, as if the most earnest consideration of the former did not most impress the unspeakable worth of the latter. Or again, that to insist on the value of the Sacraments, is to derogate from CHRIST; for when it is considered that there is no value whatever supposed in those

in the heart, that the whole heart needed to be amended. Is it not a very overstrained interpretation to apply this to the doctrine of the Atonement, on the supposition that the infinite and incomprehensible love of God manifested therein will, on being published, powerfully affect men's minds, and, on being heard, regenerate their souls? Is there any sanction whatever for this in Holy Scripture?

Sacraments, excepting from CHRIST's presence in them, and His atoning blood communicated through them, this is precisely the same as if the same charge were brought against attaching too high a value to the Holy Scriptures; for it might be said that we put the Scriptures in the place of CHRIST. It is very painful thus to be obliged to speak of these things. To answer them, we must come to plain first axioms in morals, such as the following.

5. Statement of the case from plain moral principles.

Religious doctrines and articles of faith can only be received according to certain dispositions of the heart; these dispositions can only be formed by a repetition of certain actions¹. And therefore a certain course of action can alone dispose us to receive certain doctrines; and hence it is evident that these doctrines are in vain preached, unless these actions are at the same time practised and insisted on as most essential.

For instance, charitable works alone will make a man charitable, and the more any one does charitable works, the more charitable will he become; that is to say, the more will he love his neighbour and love God; for a charitable work is a work that proceeds from charity or the love of God, and which can only be done by the good SPIRIT of GOD: and the more he does these works

¹ This is simply founded on the account which Bishop Butler gives of the formation of moral habits. See *The Analogy. Of a State of Moral Discipline*. It is, moreover, curious to observe how entirely Aristotle's system in this respect coincides with Holy Scripture, which makes our salvation to depend both on our mode of life, and also on our accepting certain articles of faith. For according to Aristotle, the perception of any moral truth depends on the life which a person leads. He says, that it depends not on intellect itself, as in pure science; but that the understanding must have combined with it a certain desire, love, or motive (*ὁρεξις* or *ἔνεκα τοῦ*); but this desire or motive depends on the mode of life (*ἡθικὴ ἕξις*), and is given by it. (B. vii.) In another place he says, that which is truly good does not appear but to him who leads a good life; and at another time, that a man must be brought up well to understand morals; and that the faculty of discerning truth, vice destroys. From which it would follow, that if any article of the Creed is less received than another, it is owing to some peculiarity in the life and conduct, either of an individual or an age, that rejects it.

therefore, the more will he love his neighbour and love God: and he who does not (in heart and intention at least) perform these works, will not be a charitable man, *i. e.*, will not love God or his neighbour: and those are not charitable works which have not this effect; for no external act, such as the giving away of money, is necessarily a work of charity, but only such as consists in the exercise of the principle of charity. He therefore will, most of all, love God and love CHRIST, who does these works most; and he will most bring men to CHRIST, who most effectually, with God's blessing, induces them to do these works in the way that God hath required them to be done.

Or again, he only will be humble in heart who does humble actions; and no action is (morally speaking) an humble action but such as proceeds from the spirit of humility; and he who does humble actions most will be most humble; and he who is most humble will be most emptied of self-righteousness, and therefore will most of all value the Cross of CHRIST, being least of all sensible of his own good deeds: and the more he does these works, the more will the HOLY SPIRIT dwell with him, according to the promises of Scripture, and the more fully will he come to the knowledge of that mystery which is hid in CHRIST. That teacher, therefore, who will most induce men to do these works, will most of all bring men unto CHRIST, though he speaks not most fully and loudly of His ever blessed Atonement.

Or again, good works consist especially in Prayers. He who does most of these good works, *i. e.* he who prays most, seeks most of all for an assistance out of, and beyond himself, and therefore relies least of all on himself and most of all upon God; and the more he does these good works, the more does he rely upon God's good SPIRIT, for which he seeks. He, therefore, who, by preaching the judgment to come, or by recommending alms and fasting, or by impressing men with a sense of the shortness of life and the value of eternity, or by any such practical appeals which the occasion suggests, will lead men most to pray, will do most towards leading them to lean on God's good SPIRIT, although he may not repeat in express words the necessity of aid from that good SPIRIT, without whom we cannot please God.

To say, therefore, that such works, which alone are good works, tend to foster pride, and are a seeking for expiations beyond the one great Atonement, conveys a most dangerous fallacy ; when the works which are intended, if the words can be applied to anything worthy of condemnation, must be bad works, those of ostentation, of hypocrisy, or superstition, and the like, which, of course, the oftener they are repeated, the more do they make men ostentatious, hypocritical, or superstitious ; and so do take them from the Cross of CHRIST. They are sins against which we cannot warn men too much ; sins repeatedly condemned by CHRIST, who never condemns or disparages good works, but insists upon them always and throughout most earnestly. Let hypocrisy, in all its shapes, be condemned as Scripture condemns, and we shall fully understand such teaching. Or again, consider the case morally with regard to the teaching of Repentance. For instance, take the deceivable sin of covetousness, of which we are all in danger. A covetous man is he who trusts in riches ; and so far as any one trusts in riches, in that degree he cannot trust in God, and therefore can have no saving sense of the atonement of CHRIST, or dependence on the good SPIRIT of God. And if his feelings are excited on the subject of these doctrines, while he is under the influence of this vice, it cannot be any thing better than a mere delusion of the fancy ; and therefore that teacher who will most of all lead men to abandon and get rid of covetousness, will render their minds most open to receive these two great doctrines of the Gospel ; as seen in the case of Zaccheus, when salvation came to his house as a true child of faith ; and in our LORD's advice to all to sell and give alms. The same inference may be drawn with regard to the love of praise, in which case it may likewise be shown that it follows as a plain moral consequence, what our Lord has declared, that they cannot " believe who receive honour one of another." So also with respect to impurity of heart ; for a man of impure heart may be very sensibly affected by these touching and vital doctrines of the Gospel ; and yet it is certain that he cannot receive them rightly ; for the pure in heart alone can see God ; and therefore can alone see, so as rightly to understand, those doctrines in which God is manifested.

That minister, therefore, who, by preaching the terrors of the judgment day, or by any other Scriptural means, induces men to repent of these crimes, will necessarily, and by a plain moral consequence, open their eyes, their ears, their heart, to receive the high saving principles of the Gospel ; though he speaks not explicitly of them any more than the Baptist did, or our LORD, or His Apostles. So palpably absurd, even on the plain grounds of moral principles, is it to speak of the teaching of repentance being opposed to the preaching of CHRIST.

This is an explanation of some obvious reasons why Holy Scripture should connect our own cross with the Cross of CHRIST, as it so often does, and emblematically typified of the Church, in him who bore the cross after Christ ; for it is said to us all, " whosoever doth not take up his cross and come after Me cannot be My disciple." Now there can be no repentance, and no progress in religious duties without self-denial. These duties, therefore, are a bearing of our own cross, which will alone bring us to a right use of the Cross of CHRIST. It is not setting aside the Cross of CHRIST, nor disparaging it ; it is only showing the mode by which alone we may be brought to know its inestimable value.

He who most of all practises these duties, will be most of all brought, by a necessary and moral consequence, to value the Cross of CHRIST ; and he who is brought to embrace that doctrine with most affection, will speak of it with most reserve ; he cannot speak of it as these persons require. Nor can there be any reasonable apprehension, as it is sometimes said, that the teaching of the Church, which keeps the doctrine of the Atonement in the reserve of Scripture, will lead men to despair. Did any one ever know an instance of this, of a Christian, in sound health of mind, brought to a state of despair from the fear of God and His judgments ? There is a mistake in this use of the word despair, which rather means a careless, hopeless indifference to the anger of the Almighty, which is so common, than an excessive fear of His judgments. Such a fear brings with it abundant consolation and hope ; and therefore the true knowledge of this saving doctrine of the Atonement is expressed in such words as these, that " the salvation of God is nigh unto them that fear Him ;" that the LORD

looks to him who "trembles at His word;" that He "revives the spirit of the contrite;" or that "whoso is wise will ponder these things; and they shall understand the loving-kindness of the LORD."

We must again return to and repeat this point; good works, being nothing else but the exercise of a good principle, will make a good man (as far as, humanly speaking, a man can be called good), and those are not good works which will not make a man good; and he is not a good man, who does not love God with all his heart, and depend on the aid of the blessed SPIRIT, and trust in CHRIST. He, therefore, who most of all induces men to practise good works, under the awful sense of their condition as baptized Christians, brings them most of all to the Cross of CHRIST; and he who, by his teaching, leads men to think that such works are of minor importance, and speaks slightly of them, *i. e.*, works of charity, of humiliation, and prayer, teaches men false and dangerous doctrine, flattering to human indolence, but opposed to Scripture, opposed to the Church, opposed to the first principles of our moral nature; and therefore it is said emphatically, "Whosoever shall break one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven:" that is to say, he who treats slightly these good works, shall obtain least of all the blessings of CHRIST'S Spiritual kingdom at present, the gracious gifts which are in the Atonement of CHRIST, and by consequence be the lowest in His kingdom hereafter. By using high words of doctrine, without the inculcation of these commands, we lead men to trust to a vain shadow, instead of the Rock of their salvation. Doing the works or not it is which makes the entire difference between the house built on the sand, and that which is founded on a rock, though outwardly they appear alike; as our LORD has warned, he who "heareth these words *and doeth them*, I will liken to a wise man, who built his house on a rock;" and "every one who heareth them *and doeth them not*," is outwardly the same, perhaps, but has no foundation. And what is the rock on which he is built, but CHRIST? His very works are built on

this Rock, otherwise they are not good works. It is not as if CHRIST was the end only (as they who disparage Baptism would imply); not as if the Atonement were a thing to be arrived at at last; but CHRIST is the way also, the beginning and the end, the Author and the Finisher, the Alpha and Omega. It is through the blood of CHRIST alone we are able to think or do what is good. It is through His blood alone that such thoughts and deeds are accepted. It is not simply that by bearing our cross we are brought to Him; but we are in Him, and He in us; our cross is His Cross, and His Cross is our cross. When we humble ourselves, we partake of the virtue going forth from His humiliation: it is He that is drawing us nearer to Himself. When we pray, it is not our prayer, but His HOLY SPIRIT within us that leads us unto Himself. When we do works of charity, it is to Him in His brethren: it is His compassionate bowels yearning in us towards them: it is the virtue of His ineffable charity through us, His members, again flowing forth to all mankind. To check, therefore, such works by any mis-statements, by half admonitions and half encouragements, is to keep men from Him. It is like stopping the mouths of the blind men, who have no way to approach Him but by prayer, that He may open their eyes; for unless we practise these works of obedience and repentance, we shall assuredly have no eyes to see Him; for it is "the commandment of the LORD" which "giveth light unto the eyes." It is putting away the little children, the babes in CHRIST, because they are not of full stature. It is casting stumbling-blocks in the way of weak men. It is very true, that in the Gospels, the consolations of CHRIST may be more imparted to persons who were opprobriously designated "sinners;" and some of whom may have fallen into grievous sin; that "the publicans and harlots enter into the kingdom before the Pharisees:" but why? not because they were worse, but because they were far better than the Pharisees; as the poor and despised are perhaps generally found wiser and better than those in higher station.

6. *All Scripture is perfect harmony as opposed to this modern system.*

We must again return to, and repeat the same point. Good works must ever make a good man ; and a good man will most of all love God, as manifested in JESUS CHRIST ; and therefore it is that Holy Scripture has put the case in every variety of ways, in order that, comparing the manifold expressions by which it describes the inscrutable mysteries of CHRIST's kingdom, we may arrive at some sense of the truth. And in whatever way we consider it, we shall find that the whole harmony of Scriptural teaching is opposed to the present system, or what is sometimes designated the Gospel scheme ; the former being, in contrast to it, one of Reserve. We have shown, from obvious moral inference, that to ameliorate the heart and practice is the only way to arrive at those riches which are hid in CHRIST. Surely a little reflection will show how thoroughly Holy Scripture supports this opinion throughout. Let us only look to the manner in which the commandments are spoken of, and that not merely in the New Testament, but in the Old also. Could words be applied to them such as we find throughout the Psalms, as, for instance, in the 19th and 119th, unless they had some mysterious connexion with the Cross of CHRIST? How else could they be "sweeter than honey and the honeycomb?" How else could they be "dearer than thousands of gold and silver?" How else could they be "wonderful," and "quickenings," "giving light unto the eyes," and "everlasting righteousness?" Let us again consider the expressions by which the Gospel privileges are spoken of in Scripture, and we shall find that they are all connected with certain dispositions and graces, and confined to them. Those dispositions and graces can alone be attained by a certain mode of life and course of actions ; which actions, therefore, Scripture commands and inculcates in every way, by bringing before us every example, and precept, and doctrine, that may be calculated to affect us with the terrors of God's judgments, or the hopes of His mercy.

Let us consider who they are whom Scripture pronounces as blessed. It might be supposed from the modern system, that the expression had been, "Blessed are all ye that hear the Gospel," and that this Gospel is confined to a full declaration of the gracious doctrine of the Atonement; but it is not thus it speaks. It is, indeed, said to some, "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see, and blessed are the ears which hear the things that ye hear,"—but then it must be ever remembered, and again repeated, that this was not said unto all the people to whom our LORD had been preaching: but to the disciples "privately," in express distinction from those who had heard our LORD teaching, but who, as He said, had no "eyes to see, nor ears to hear." Whereas in His more public teaching, His blessing was entirely confined and limited to certain dispositions, which are recorded in the Sermon on the Mount.

Blessing again is pronounced privately on St. Peter, because he had been brought to that high knowledge of CHRIST by GOD Himself: as in the case of all the disciples, our LORD thanked GOD for having "revealed these things unto babes." And after these declarations to St. Peter, pronouncing His blessedness, and the greatness of that belief on which the Church would be built; we naturally expect our LORD to invite others to it, either by openly declaring that doctrine, or by showing them the way to arrive at it; we watch His words with expectation, especially when He calls all the multitude unto Him: but, so far from declaring unto them these gracious and high things, He speaks of the necessity of every man taking up his cross. This was, in fact, telling the people in what way they might arrive at that belief for which St. Peter was so blessed. For let it be observed, that this was the mode by which St. Peter had arrived at it. He had taken up the Cross at the first, and followed CHRIST when He called him to forsake all; and the result was, that he had now come to the full knowledge of that Truth. To suppose, therefore, that a doctrine so unspeakable and mysterious as that of the Atonement, is to be held out to the impenitent sinner, to be embraced in some manner to move the affections, is so unlike our LORD's conduct, that it makes one fear for the ultimate consequences of such a system.

Or again, consider the case of Judas Iscariot ; what was the cause of his not believing ? it was simply this, that he had one unrepented sin in his heart. He must have witnessed many miracles, and heard our LORD's Divine teaching ; and might have seen His unexampled and transcendent goodness and holiness. But this one sin blinded his eyes and stopped his ears, so that seeing he saw not, and hearing heard not. Had he taken the Baptist's advice to repent ; or our LORD's warnings on the subject of riches, or those so often graciously given to himself,—as when He said " Ye are clean, but not all," and " one of you shall betray me," and " It were good for that man, if he had never been born," then he might have believed ; and might have been possibly " the beloved disciple." In his case, humanly speaking, so far as we can perceive, repentance would have been one with believing in CHRIST. And surely our LORD's conduct to Judas might show us how men might do all that can be done to reclaim a very bad person, without any display of the most ineffable mercies of God, beyond what the occasion called for.

But, moreover, if we take the mere general outline and first view of the Gospel narrative, it is so like all God's manifestations of Himself to the world, and the history of what the Church was to be, that it ever occurs to one as showing the principles of it. " The Desire of all nations had come," " the Messenger of the covenant whom men delight in ;" but He was to be " as a refiner's fire." The power of the cross was to be shown especially in this its secret character, whereby the strength of God being concealed in human weakness, it might act as a test to the dispositions of men : it was to be " a sign that should be spoken against, in order that the thoughts of many hearts might be revealed." On the contrary, what do they really mean who adopt the human scheme of teaching and receiving in its fulness the doctrine of the Atonement ? how is this to be done ? do they understand the meaning of their own words ? We hardly know what we speak of when we speak of the Atonement, it is a vast sea which no man can fathom : who can think of it worthily ? who can comprehend the Sacraments in which it is hidden ? The sea, indeed, itself, is the type or figure of Baptism,

wherein the ways of God are, and His paths in the great waters, and His footsteps are not known. Surely men know not what they do, when they define and systematize the ways of God in man's redemption, under expressions such as imputed righteousness, justification, and sanctification, and the like ; which words stand in their minds, for some exceeding shallow poor human ideas, for which they vehemently contend, as for the whole of religion. It is, in fact, to explain the ineffable, to measure the infinite, to enter into the secret counsels of God ; to circumscribe truths as vast and incomprehensible as the circuit of the heavens in the compass of human system. Whereas we know nothing whatever but this, that a childlike obedience which accepts the commands and doctrines of Scripture, will be brought to the full knowledge of God.

Surely, I repeat, we know not what we do, when we speak of the doctrine of the Atonement, and of preaching and receiving the same : we know not how much it is the very foundation of every part of Scripture, and how mysteriously it may be contained therein, "the LAMB slain from the foundation of the world." Doubtless, we may suppose that our LORD went about in the fulness of the power of the Atonement, (if we may so speak,) out of that vast sea of mercy, dispensing to men as they were able to receive it : what were the bodily cures that He wrought, connected as they were with the forgiveness of sins ; and what the various blessings that He pronounced ? but the distributing of those gifts according as the dispositions of men made them capable of receiving them. To one it was the kingdom of heaven, to another it was consolation, to another it was the inheritance of the earth, to another it was righteousness, to another it was mercy, to another it was the power to see God ; thus was the unspeakable power of the Atonement, in all the beatitudes, distributed according to each man's obedience. Not as gifts falling from heaven into the cup of each ; but in every case as a pearl of great price, as hid treasure. To another it is spoken of as "refreshment," to another "as rest for the soul," to another as being to JESUS CHRIST as "brother and sister and mother ;" to another that GOD the FATHER, and JESUS CHRIST, and the COMFORTER will

come to "make their abode with him." But observe on each of these occasions, how perfectly mysterious and secret the gift is ; how closely limited and restricted to certain tempers or conditions ; how on every occasion the conditions are put first, the disposition required, or the keeping of the commandments, and the gifts as following : in short, these promises and privileges vouchsafed to the Christian are distributed in a manner perfectly analogous to the miracles, which were dispensed, as it would appear, by an invariable law according to the faith of each. And both of them upon a principle quite opposed to these modern opinions, which speak of "the *display* of God's mercy in the Atonement." Observe how, on all occasions, the very opposite conduct is pursued to that of the human system. The LORD of heaven and earth, in the full power of His Divinity and atoning mercy, but ever as it were hiding Himself, as a poor man going about with a few fishermen, calling every one that came to Him to undisguised privation and hardship, putting these as it were always first, and keeping back the blessing ; checking men, and setting aside their offers of attendance, when they expected any thing but hardship ; as when to the Scribe He said, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head ;" or demanding an instant surrender without delay, as of him to whom He said, "Let the dead bury the dead, but follow thou me." And let us notice the rich man whom "He loved ;" and who seemed what would be called deficient in spiritual views, and in a right understanding of the nature of the Gospel ;—how differently did our LORD treat him, to that conduct which these modern religionists would require us to adopt, when He called upon him to the practice of the most self-denying duties and the exercise of charity.

And observe how necessarily all these gifts, in which the kingdom of heaven consists, are attached, and invariably imparted to these conditions, and inseparable from them : so that to have the dispositions, or to fulfil the commands required, is in that degree to partake of the spiritual blessings ; and not to fulfil them is to fail of those gifts. Thus when we are commanded to learn of CHRIST "to be meek and lowly, and we shall find rest ;" so far as

we become meek and lowly we shall find rest to our souls : and this rest is not imparted to any but so far as they are so. And when CHRIST says, that if we keep His commandments, He will come and make His abode with us ; so far as we keep the commandments, we shall assuredly have CHRIST abiding with us ; and so far as He abides with us, we shall of course be made partakers of all the privileges of the Gospel, both now and hereafter. Whosoever therefore will himself keep the commandments, and induce us to do so, will so far be himself a partaker of the Gospel, and make us to be so, as a necessary and infallible consequence. The same argument may be applied, if considered with respect to every blessing in the Gospels, taken separately with a view to the temper connected with it ; for instance, the poor in spirit does naturally, and of necessity come to the enjoyment of the Christian inheritance ; whatever teaching, therefore, disengages men from the love of wealth, will bring them so far into their Christian inheritance ; every act which produces this spirit, leads men so far one step into the possession of this their Christian birthright. We have repeated these points more at large from the former treatise, in order to show, in connexion with the moral proof, how fully the Scriptural statements confirm all that has been said concerning actions and habits ; that actions alone can produce dispositions, and dispositions alone can receive doctrines, when the case is viewed with regard to our moral constitution. Or to state it in a higher point of view, all knowledge of saving doctrine is revealed from above to those who will do the will ; for every act of obedience is rewarded of God with additional light, and the fulness of this light, illuminating the path of obedience, is the knowledge of God. So that in whatever way we consider it, there is no Scriptural sanction for the necessity of our always thrusting forward the doctrine of the Atonement without reserve.

And here we cannot forbear asking in seriousness, whether it be not such a failure in inculcating Christian practice, which may have cherished such dispositions, as are plainly betrayed in the words and actions of those who avow and maintain this system ; dispositions and tempers which, whether they result

from this system or no, could not possibly have resulted from a proper discipline of the heart under Scriptural teaching.

But to return, the same harmony of Scripture may be shown in the variety and apparent discrepancy, by which not only the different tempers and graces which Scripture inculcates are designated, as we have seen, but the one thing that is needful in order to obtain eternal life. In one place it is said, "Believe in CHRIST, and thou shalt be saved." Whereas in another place our LORD says, "If thou wouldst enter into life, keep the commandments." So that these two requisites will necessarily imply each other, and somehow to keep the commandments will lead us to CHRIST, and will be believing in Him. But the commandments contain the love of God and the love of our neighbour; and to know this principle, the spiritual interpretation of the commandments, our LORD told the Lawyer, was to be "not far from the kingdom of heaven:" and this was the test which our LORD put to the rich young man whom He loved, telling him to give to the poor and follow Him. These two points, therefore, in this case, would put it to the proof, whether he had kept the commandments or understood the spirit of them. Agreeably to this, St. Paul tells us in another place, that faith will profit us nothing, and works will profit us nothing, without charity, which alone availeth. On the other hand, St. John tells us that to know God is eternal life; therefore faith, and obedience, and charity, and knowledge, must in some sense be one and the same, or necessarily imply each other. For if we keep the commandments, we shall enter into life, and if we have charity, we shall enter into life; and so also if we believe in CHRIST, or know CHRIST, it is eternal life. And yet not one of these without the other. If, therefore, God's promises partake of so great diversity, may not our teaching partake of this variety of God's Word, without our being bound to one human system? And why may not those who inculcate love and obedience lead men to the Truth?

Surely it is sufficient to say, that we are following the method of Scripture: nor can any thing else be truly said to partake of the *πᾶσις* of God's Word, and to be "not shunning to declare the whole counsel of God." The whole case might be put

very simply to any unprejudiced mind : let it be granted, that the degree of happiness the good will attain hereafter depends on their sense of, and trust in, the Atonement of CHRIST; yet nevertheless this is also true, that he who humbles himself most on earth, will be the highest in heaven : or again, it is also true, that the degree of the rewards hereafter will depend on, and be proportionate to, the use of the talents which have been given ; and therefore, if objection is made to our inculcating these things, it is a sufficient answer, that we are but following the method and commands of Scripture. This would be quite sufficient for a childlike obedience. But when we come to consider the nature of religious principles, and to "compare things spiritual with spiritual," then we obtain a glimpse of that vast and mysterious truth laid up in the counsels of God, that it is he who humbles himself most, and obeys most dutifully, who attains most of all unto a right and saving sense of the Atonement of CHRIST. And thus we come again to the same point with regard to our teaching, as for instance, that he who most of all impresses himself and others with a sense of the day of judgment, will most of all lead himself and others to keep the commandments ; and he who does this will be the most humble, and will most of all embrace the doctrine of the Atonement ; whereas he who puts forward this doctrine most prominently, in a manner different from this general analogy of God's Word, may be taking persons furthest from it.

Again, we have said the necessary effect of keeping the commandments, is to empty a man of self-righteousness, and therefore to bring him to CHRIST Crucified. Now this might be shown in all the examples of holy men in Scripture : for whatever other graces they might have, they are all marked with humility. And that humility in proportion to their obedience, and their faith in proportion to their humility. Thus St. Paul, because he had always laboured to have "a conscience void of offence both towards God and man," and in the Gospel had "laboured more abundantly" than all the Apostles, therefore felt himself the *chief of sinners* : words which our own devout and laborious Hammond eagerly and emphatically at his last Communion ex-

claimed of himself: and the good Bishop Andrews, in all his devotions speaks of himself as τὸν πᾶν ἁμαρτωλὸν, τὸν ἁμαρτωλὸν ὑπὲρ τελωνού. These holy men loved much, because they felt they had much forgiven; and they felt they had much forgiven, because they loved much. For it has been well said, "The best men know they are very far from what they ought to be, and the very worst think that, if they were but a little better, they should be as good as they need be¹." So far therefore as we keep the commandments we shall embrace the Atonement, and so far only, whether we speak of it or not. But how very inconsistent with this is the mode which this system has introduced, of judging of the saints of God according to this rule, viz. how far and how much they speak of the Atonement! Holy Scripture itself is hardly sufficient to shield the man of God. Before the publication of the Gospel indeed, such a full declaration is not expected and among the very few that since appear before us in Holy Writ, St. James has been by one great name given up, because he cannot stand by this peculiar criterion of saving Faith. And surely this principle upon which sentence is pronounced on the Saints of the primitive Church, is quite irreconcilable with the general tenor of Scripture; for their devotional and practical graces are allowed, but they are supposed to have misunderstood and misinterpreted the true nature of the Gospel; that is to say, they gave up houses and lands, and parents and wives and children for the sake of CHRIST and the Gospel, but did not receive the promises annexed to doing so in the present, or in future time; that they were meek, but did not inherit the kingdom; that they mourned, but were not comforted; that they kept CHRIST's commandments, but He did not, according to His promise, manifest Himself unto them. And is all this to be inferred from their not speaking of the Atonement? why was this of such vital importance? And consider what great injury is done to a generation who are taught to disparage these holy men, who spent their days and nights in frequent prayers, in fastings, and mortification, and retirement from the world. Men have been induced to believe

¹ Froude's Remains, part ii. vol. i. p. 49.

that this was not only unnecessary, that they took not merely a circuitous and difficult way to obtain the favour of God, whereas the true way was comparatively very short and easy ; but that these saints of God have failed of the right and saving way altogether.

7. *On eloquent preaching and delivery.*

There is another important point in which the modern system is opposed to Scripture in breaking the spirit of reserve, *viz.*, in attaching so great a value to preaching as to disparage Prayer and Sacraments in comparison. According to this the Church of God would be the House of Preaching ; but Scripture calls it the House of Prayer. But with regard to the subject of preaching altogether, it is, in the present day, taken for granted, that eloquence in speech is the most powerful means of promoting religion in the world. But if this be the case, it occurs to one as remarkable, that there is no intimation of this in Scripture : perhaps no single expression can be found in any part of it that implies it : there is no recommendation of rhetoric in precept, or example, or prophecy. There is no instance of it ; no part of Scripture itself appears in this shape, as the remains of what was delivered with powerful eloquence. Many parts of it consist of poetry, none of oratory ; and it is remarkable that the former partakes more of this reserve, the latter less so. It speaks of instruction, "precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little," but never of powerful appeals of speech. The great teacher of the Gentiles, in whom we would most of all have expected to find it, was "weak in bodily presence, and in speech contemptible ;" and rendered so, it is supposed, by "a thorn in the flesh." Whereas, it would be thought by many now, that the great requisites for a successful minister are a powerful bodily presence and eloquent speech. Indeed, St. Paul says, that the effect of words of men's wisdom would be to render the Cross of CHRIST of none effect. It is, moreover, observable, that in Scripture all the words denoting a minister of the Gospel throw us back on the commission. Such, for instance, is the word "Apostle," or "the

Sent," which title is repeated with a remarkable frequency and emphasis, and united, in one instance, with the awful and high expression, "As my FATHER hath sent me, even so send I you." And the word "preaching," as now used, has a meaning attached to it derived from modern notions, which we shall not find in Scripture. "A preacher," indeed, properly conveys the same idea as "Apostle," and really signifies the same thing—"a herald;" for, of course, all the office of a herald depends on him that sent him, not so much on himself, or his mode of delivering his message. All other words, in like manner adopted in the Church, speak the same; they all designate him as one *ministering* or *serving* at God's altar, not as one whose first object is to be useful to men; such, for instance, are the appellations of *diaconus*, *sacerdos*. It is curious that our word "minister," implying also the same, comes to be commonly used in the other sense, being applied, like that of preacher, to self-created teachers. Thus do men's opinions invest sacred appellations¹ with new meanings, according to the change in their own views.

If people in general were now asked what was the most powerful means of advancing the cause of religion in the world, we should be told that it was eloquence of speech or preaching: and the excellency of speech we know consists in delivery; that is the first, the second, and the third requisite. Whereas, if we were to judge from Holy Scripture, of what were the best means of promoting Christianity in the world, we should say obedience; and

¹ An instance of this may be mentioned in the solemn injunction of St. Paul to Timothy, "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season:" in the meaning which is often attached to this passage, it might readily be quoted against us, and is often made use of to uphold the opposite opinions. But when the true sense of the expression is considered, and it is taken together with the context, it would serve to set forth all we say of the right teaching the doctrine of the Atonement, in contradistinction from that which we condemn. "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine." Here there is nothing at all respecting a display of the doctrine of the Atonement; but, on the contrary, it is enjoined that with long-suffering, reproof, rebuke, and exhortation are to be instantly urged. It is a testimony to the truth, which requires patience and courage.

if we were to be asked the second, we should say obedience ; and if we were to be asked the third, we should say obedience. And it is evident, that if the spirit of obedience exists, simple and calm statement of truth will go far. Not that we would be thought entirely to depreciate preaching as a mode of doing good : it may be necessary in a weak and languishing state ; but it is the characteristic of this system as opposed to that of the Church, and we fear the undue exaltation of an instrument which Scripture, to say the least, has never much recommended. And, indeed, if from Revelation we turn to the great teachers of morals which have been in the world, we shall be surprised to find how little they esteemed it useful for their purpose. The exceeding jealous apprehension of rhetoric which Socrates evinces is remarkable, as shown throughout the *Gorgias*. Nor does it ever seem to have occurred to the sages of old, as a means of promoting morality ; and yet some of them, as Pythagoras and Socrates, made this purpose, *vis.*, that of improving the principles of men, the object of their lives : and the former was remarkable for his mysterious discipline, and the silence he imposed ; the latter for a mode of questioning, which may be considered as entirely an instance of this kind of reserve in teaching.

And here again, if we are referred to expediency and visible effects, let us ask what these effects are. They have the effect of bringing people together in crowds, of creating strong religious impressions : so far it may be well ; but even then, to all strong feelings the saying may be justly applied, "*quod est violentum non est diuturnum.*" But does this system make men more desirous to learn, and more exact in adhering to truth ? Does this system in the long run make men more humble and obedient to their appointed ministers, more frequent in attending the daily prayers, more honest and just in their dealings with mankind ? Does it lead men to think more of God and His appointments, and less of men and their gifts. Does it produce a healthful and reverential tone of feeling respecting the blessed Sacraments ? Are persons who have been used to popular preaching more submissive to Divine ordinances, and more easily moved to the self-denying duties of repentance and prayer ? But on this point,

with regard to religious effects, even did they appear satisfactory, yet we are, in fact, no judges at all on this subject; the next world only can show this: here we walk by faith, not by sight. Certainly the silence of Scripture should make us cautious how we allow too much to this instrument. The great importance now attributed to these means is sufficient to show the tendency of the system; it is one of expediency, it looks to man: that of the Church is one of faith, and looks to God. Their principle is to speak much and loud, because it is to man; that of the Church is founded on this, "that God is in Heaven, and we on earth;" therefore, "keep thy foot in the House of God," and "let thy words be few."

8. *This system a worldly system.*

It is very remarkable, how much this new scheme of religion is an instance of an observation which has been made, that they who set out with the profession of principles holier, or wiser, or purer than those of Holy Scripture, do ultimately tend to the virtual denial of those very truths which they professed most strictly to uphold. They who maintain that the Church does not sufficiently preach the dependence of man upon God, and trust in the Atonement, do practically, in their whole system, tend to derogate from those truths themselves, while the Church continues to hold them. They consider, for instance, that the efficacy of a preacher consists in human eloquence and activity, and not in the power of his Divine commission, which is, in fact, to set up something else, which may be sensibly felt, for the Divine gifts of the SPIRIT. By disparaging the efficacy of the Sacraments, they have come to substitute for them something like a meritorious act, or opinion, on the part of an individual. Professing to be guided exclusively by the written Word, they have established a method so opposed to it, as to render the greater part of it superfluous. Requiring us to speak loudly of Spiritual assistance, they have set at nought all those practices, whose sole end and object was to live in that invisible world, and to partake of its gifts. For men have been led to reflect, censure, and even ridicule, not on the su-

perstitious and wrong observance of Sacramental Ordinances, and Creeds, and Prayers, but on the punctual observance of them at all ; and sentiments are expressed which would brand with superstition the devout Daniel for his unbending adherence to times and circumstances of devotion ; and the widow Anna, who departed not from the temple, with formalism. And all this arises from the fact, that these opinions are not thoroughly and unreservedly based on Holy Scripture, and therefore look too much to external support.

The very principle of sound Religion is that the world " knoweth it not, as it knew Him not : " its rules of action are so essentially opposed, that they cannot understand each other, from something of an essential nature different. The system, on the contrary, of which we speak, has ever the indirect object of making a league with it,—not externally, on the contrary, it has devised externally strongly-marked lines of demarcation and distinctions, which do not extend to the thoughts or character ; and in every way has substituted a great unreal system, nominal, superficial, formal, though in name spiritual, and the more formal in reality, because in name spiritual. Where God is, there must be the fear of Him.

For this reason it has come to pass that names of the most awful and holy import have been so used habitually, that they carry not with them their own high and awful meaning, even the Names of the ever-blessed Trinity. Not only have they become used without reverence, and very much as the distinctive signs of a party,—but the very use of them tends to keep up this feeling of unreality, and without bearing on the heart and conduct. Whereas homefelt natural expressions in which any one who is in earnest is apt to clothe his sentiments, and which touch the heart and conscience of another, as they come from his own, are disliked ; because they break through this unreal web, and bear more upon the daily life and conscience.

All this is substituting a system of man's own creation for that which God has given. Instead of the Sacraments and external ordinances, it has put forth prominently a supposed sense of the Atonement, as the badge of a profession. That which is most

thoroughly internal, most thoroughly spiritual, secret, and holy, it has made the external symbol of agreement; and therefore has completely (so to speak) turned people inside out, wherever it is received: and thus it has lost the essential peculiarity of Christianity, that purity of heart which is directed to "the Eye that seeth in secret." This spirit has thoroughly imbued their whole system, in the same manner that it has prevailed in the corruptions of Rome. In the case of the latter, the use of external symbols the most sacred, has lost much of its power, by rude exposure to the gaze of the world; so is it with this system in the use of words; they have lost their proper sense and meaning, and have a peculiar signification. That dread doctrine so essential as received into the heart, the very foundation of life and actions, has come with them to consist in that which can be called up from time to time, and satisfy the professor in sensible emotions and satisfactions. Works as performed strictly in secret, and directed to the eye of God, cannot but be life-giving and good: the corruptions of Rome have substituted for these external actions; and this system external professions. The eye of man is on both, unhallowing the holy things of God, and engendering pride. Hence has arisen among them that rejection of natural modesty, and sacred reserve, on the subject of religion in discourse and writing:—attempts to remedy certain effects and symptoms of the want of religion, instead of that want itself. Much indeed of this may arise from a natural craving after sympathy on the highest of all subjects, and from having lost the legitimate expressions of it. External visible Communion must be preserved by external visible means; when these are withdrawn, sacred principles or sacred feelings will be outwardly substituted. In proof of this, it may be observed, that a Sect which has least of all to distinguish it in doctrine or discipline as a separate body, the Wesleyans, are most under the influence of what is here condemned, to the great injury of their moral character: words with them do not signify what they do with others. Instead of visible means of grace, and participation in the same Sacraments, being the bonds of union, something in external speech or demeanour becomes substituted. A still more remarkable instance may be seen in

the Sect denominated the Society of Friends, who, after labouring to divest themselves of all the appearances of a visible Church and visible Sacraments, have become from external garb and mode of speech, the most visible of all Societies.

It must be allowed that this modern system did for a time partake of "the reproach of CHRIST," and did in that strength prevail for a season. In that reproach, all good Christians will be glad to share with them. Doubtless the very name of CHRIST must ever carry with it a blessing ; and earnestness in religion, in views however mistaken, seems ever to have annexed to it the reward of God. And for a time this earnestness of mind carried with it incidentally much good, and led men to embrace other great truths of Christianity, and perhaps that of CHRIST Crucified, in reality as well as in name ; being far better themselves than their system, and better in their practice than in their opinions, which they held rather speculatively and controversially, than practically : but these things for a while corrected by the sincerity of individuals have gone by, and left the legitimate fruits of the system. The evils it has led to in various forms of dissent are too evident wherever we turn our eyes, leading men to the neglect of honesty and plain dealing, and at length to indifference, unsettledness, and infidelity. In the Church it excludes with jealous eagerness all things that may alarm the consciences of those who heartily adopt the system, obedience to Church authority, practices of mortification, the fear of God, and the doctrine of judgment to come. It sets forth religion in colours attractive to the world, by stimulating the affections, and by stifling the conscience, rather than by purifying and humbling the heart. Hence its great prevalence in places of fashionable resort. And to those who have in any way forfeited their character for religion and morality or sound doctrine, instead of the process of painful secret self-discipline and gradual restoration, or the open and salutary penance of the Ancient Church, it affords an instant and ready mode for assuming at once all the privileges and authority of advanced piety. And the consequence is, that real humility of heart, and a quiet walking in the ordinances of God, finds not only the world in array against it, but that which

considers itself as Christianity also. Through all its appearances it is marked by a want of reverence ; and therefore it can use worldly instruments and worldly organs. It may serve as a ready cloak to cover an unsubdued temper and a worldly spirit, concealing them as well from the individual himself as from others. It may offer a convenient refuge to those who would cling to the Establishment, rather than the Church, if she should be spoiled and persecuted. But the effect of these opinions is not confined to those who profess and receive them ; but as a great part of the office of the Gospel is to be a witness to all nations, even to those who receive it not, the witness itself, or the voice which is heard from it, becomes altered in its character. One or two great truths are thus put forth exclusively as the whole of religion ; and this has a vast effect on the whole of society, among those who do not openly avow, nor are even secretly conscious of, these opinions : the world accepts them, not even as the professors of them would themselves intend, but as palliatives to an uneasy conscience, as an assistance to throw off the sense of responsibility, and as false easy notions of repentance. Therefore it is that these peculiar views in religion amalgamate so readily with the liberal notions of the world, and both will be found readily to unite against principles of a more unbending nature. There exists a secret affinity between them.

There was one impediment in the Jews throughout, which prevented their receiving the truth ; they trusted in their being of the seed of Abraham. From this point as a centre, the evil one wove around them a web of external and specious observances, from which the great Teacher of repentance, and our Lord Himself, and St. Paul, in vain endeavoured to extricate them : they bore leaves, but no fruit. The Baptist had laid the axe to the root of the tree : our Lord had interceded for three years with the FATHER, till He should dig around it and dung it : St. Paul had endeavoured to graft within it the better stock ; but in vain ; it still bore leaves, but no fruit. The present age is one of affected refinement in sentiment combined with loose morals ; one of expediency rather than principle, of rationalism rather than faith ; one that will take all that is agreeable and beautiful

and benevolent in religion, and reject what is stern and self-denying and awful. Now the whole truth in its just proportions we have in the Creed, which God has given us as a key to Scripture, the depository of the faith in the Church, to each individual a guide and safeguard. But it is very evident that if we take one point only in religion, instead of this analogy of the Faith, we may produce a religion which may please ourselves and others, and yet may be very far from the truth as it is in Scripture, and from the principles of that new world wherein dwelleth righteousness. And it is an awful and trying question for a man to ask himself, whether the reason why he sets aside the Day of Judgment, the severe discipline of the Church, and above all the two Sacraments, in his public teaching, is not this, that in the secret care of himself he does not consider them: and whether the strong controversial party feeling, exhibited on these points, does not arise from the dislike he has to be disturbed in these easy convictions, into the truth of which he will not seriously enquire.

Now against all this leaven of a worldly system, the reserve that is here inculcated seems at once the remedy; for it strips off at once all those external indications of a religion which exists not in the heart, as rather hindrances to true piety than the promoters of it; and requires one to be reverential and considerate in all that regards it. We have nothing to show to ourselves or others, to encourage the notion that we are better than they; and may be induced to cultivate a sincere desire to be approved in the eyes of our Father "who seeth in secret." A want of reserve, an artificial religious tone in conversation or prayer is, as the good James Bonnel observes, a proof that the person is wishing to be, or wishing to persuade himself that he is, rather than that he really is religious. As far as any one is in earnest, he will act naturally with this sacred modesty, seeking to know God and do His will. And this unaffected reserve will be a great protection to him in keeping the spirit of piety fresh and true, and when he loses it, he will lose half his strength. This secret devotion will doubtless lower him in his own eyes, and in the eyes of the world, and will keep him back. He must be content to be not

understood, to be misrepresented, but this will little concern him, if he may be hid from men's eyes in the sanctuary of the Divine presence, where his prayers for them will have power with God.

PART VI.

THE SYSTEM OF THE CHURCH ONE OF RESERVE.

1. *The principle considered with reference to ourselves.*

BUT far be it from us, to put forward this sacred principle merely in condemnation of others, and their system; what we have said with regard to them is in our defence and for their warning: and we have quite as much need of it for the regulation and protection of ourselves. Indeed it might have been considered that it is for ourselves that it is more especially needed; and the subject should, one would think, have been hailed with pleasure as a pledge and indication, that what we maintain we would wish to maintain modestly and seriously. That when we consider ourselves called upon to put forward great Christian truths, which have been forgotten, we imply, by connecting this principle with them, that we consider them as matters, not for speculation or external distinction, but to be embraced practically, and as it were secretly, looking to that time when all things will be revealed.

The whole of the effects which we condemn, and which have developed themselves in a system, have been spoken of as putting forward religion with a want of reality, an absence of true seriousness; and of course the principles of the Church are liable to be taken hold of, and turned to the same purpose. But we proceed to show that the Church of itself is entirely a system of reserve. In fact, she holds all the doctrines which those who agree not with her consider most essential, but in a sort of reserve; being calculated to bring men to the heart and substance of those things of which this scheme embraces the shadow. The Church, moreover, in all her departments, is directed to the eye of God, and not to man; as the Bride who ever looks to the Bridegroom, and to none else. The one instance in her usages which partakes least of this reserved character, is the

practice of preaching which she sanctions and admits, and which alone, it is curious to observe, this human system has taken, considering it as the only instrument calculated for its purpose. The principle of the Church is, that "the secret things belong unto the LORD our GOD;" that He Himself dispenses them through His Church, as He thinks meet, to faith and obedience. Her system therefore is one of reserve.

But before we proceed to this subject, it may be requisite to say something respecting the application of the rule at all to baptized Christians. It may be said, that during the gradual revelations of the Gospel to mankind, this might have been the mode of the Divine proceeding, and very necessary; but that now among baptized Christians, "the enlightened," as they were called in the early church, all have entered into the fulness of the Christian inheritance, and we have no right to withdraw from them any part of their birthright. Or it may be said, that the mystery is now made known to all the world; every thing is perfectly different; *omnia jam vulgata*.

But now in answer to this, it must be observed, that this sacred forbearance is an universal rule in morals, and not confined to circumstances, but accompanies every progress in religious knowledge; thus the Fathers speak of it, as a rule to be observed, not only towards catechumens, but according to which the mysteries of God are revealed more and more to the last stage of Christian perfection. It is evident, that the knowledge which Scripture speaks of as life-giving goes entirely with Christian purity of heart; that in this respect, unless it will be maintained that this sincerity and purity now prevails, the rule still holds; in the Scriptural sense, men are still in darkness, and ignorance, in proportion to their vices; knowledge is to be imparted or withdrawn on the same principles. And with regard to the circumstance of men having been baptized, St. Paul did not make this an occasion of altering this rule towards his converts, but he maintains towards them precisely the same caution. This St. Augustin observes, speaking of the expression of "giving what is holy to dogs," he adds, "when the LORD says this, we must believe that He wished to signify, that unclean hearts cannot bear the

light of spiritual intelligence, and if a teacher should compel them to bear that which they do not rightly receive, inasmuch as they are not capable of doing so, they either rend him with the bitings of reprehension, or by despising, tread them under foot. For if the blessed Apostle says that he gave milk, and not meat, to those who thought they were already born again in CHRIST, yet were still babes; *for hitherto were ye not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able*; (1 Cor. iii. 2.) If, in fine, the LORD Himself said to His elect Apostles, 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now,' (John xvi. 12); how much less can unclean minds of the wicked, bear those things that are spoken of incorporeal light? "

In one point of view, our case indeed differs from that of former ages; in that the great and essential truths of our religion, which have been so long kept back, are now generally known. Our position is therefore in most material respects different, but not so, in any way, as to do away with the necessity of this natural principle.

It must be observed, that the word knowledge is used in two senses, or that there are two kinds of knowledge; the one, according to which "the knowledge of the LORD fills the earth, as the waters cover the sea:" the other, discovering One who still dwelleth in secret in the midst of these manifestations, One "whose ways are in those deep waters, and whose footsteps are not known." The one is she "who lifteth up her voice in the streets, and in the city uttereth her cry:" the other is she, "who goeth about secretly, seeking those who are worthy of her, trying them in crooked paths, and ways of discipline, until she finds that she can trust their souls." The one that which is "a savour of life and also unto death," as when our LORD says, that he who knew his LORD's will, and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes; and "if ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them;" a knowledge which without charity puffeth up. The other knowledge is that which is truly Divine and inseparable from charity; where to know and love God, is one and the same thing, and both of them eternal life. This is the gift especially of God alone, and which He dispenses

according to man's fitness to receive it ; and therefore the Church is a system of reserve. And this in no way limits or confines, but in every way strengthens the most active efforts for propagating the Gospel in the world ; which can no more be doubted than that our Lord Himself took the very best, the most engaging, and at the same time the most powerful, means of recommending truth to mankind. And indeed the Church, in which our Lord has promised to be present unto the end, may very well be compared in this respect to His visible body in the flesh ; a comparison which may be allowed, as He applied the term " temple " to His human person ; both served as a veil to His Divinity, in both He withdraws from human eyes, through both in the same manner, He manifests Himself according as persons will by faith receive Him, will take up the cross after Him, and be His disciples.

2. *The Holiness of God's House of Prayer.*

Now the whole business of the Church, as a system upon earth, is to impart to mankind this true saving knowledge ; and in so doing she is quite opposed to the restless systems of the world for imparting mere knowledge of itself. She acts therefore as her Divine Founder throughout, on a species of reserve. As one desirous above all things to prepare men's minds, and bring them to the truth, but communicating it to them as they are able to receive it. She contains as it were within herself numerous channels or modes of access, by which men may be brought to this knowledge of God. Her Sacramental ordinances are, in fact, ways to that invisible Jerusalem, that celestial fellowship, and the city of the Living God. The progressive states of proficiency in the school of CHRIST have been termed the *via purgativa*, or the way of repentance ; the *via illuminativa*, or the way of Christian knowledge ; and the *via unitiva*, or the way of charity and union with God. Now it may be seen, that Church principles contain within them these modes of bringing men to the knowledge of, and to union with God, who dwelleth in secret, after a reserved, silent, and retiring

manner. All those that are considered peculiarly Church principles, doctrines and practices, are of this character.

For instance, the Church, contrary to the human system, which we have described, looks upon houses of Divine worship as being especially sacred, and the place of God's peculiar presence. Now if this doctrine of the Church is true, then they must be the abode of some great and peculiar blessing; every body must necessarily allow, that the Divine presence must be life-giving and hallowing, and as it were sacramentally convey spiritual benefit; but now if both these opinions of the Church be true, it is evident that these blessings cannot be realized, but by particular persons and dispositions; by those who make it their reverential study to raise their minds to it, and by faith receive the blessing. These privileges, so high and spiritual, are held by the Church in a sort of reserve and silence. The case is precisely analogous to that of our Lord in the flesh; conveying now spiritual blessings, as then bodily cures, after precisely the same rule and method; and withdrawing Himself from many, who may be inclined to doubt and ridicule such a supposition. That such a sense of the holiness of Churches is itself beneficial to the moral character, may be inferred from the high authority of Bishop Butler, the great master of morals, who recommends some devotional act of the mind, as a reverential exercise, to be practised at the very sight of a Church. And there is something in Holy Scripture most mysteriously striking, and awful, on this subject; as for instance, the sanctity, and adoration, claimed so strongly in the Old Testament for the place where God vouchsafed to disclose His presence, of which there are many instances. And perhaps there is no circumstance in all the account of our SAVIOUR's life, which so arrests and demands our awful attention, as that of His driving the buyers out of the temple, when He would suffer no "vessel to be carried through it." In the first place, because this action was so different in its character to all other actions of our Lord; in the next place, because it was twice repeated; and lastly, because it implied a sense of holiness so transporting as to have carried Him, humanly speaking, beyond Himself, fulfilling the expression of the Psalmist, "the zeal of

Thine house hath eaten me up." Since therefore no man can equal the sense of veneration here expressed, for God's "House of Prayer," therefore no one can exceed on this subject; the case is in some respect analogous to an adoration of our Lord's Divinity when seen in the flesh. And the effect and cause become mutually implicated in bearing on the moral character: the most holy men will most reverence the place of God's presence, and he who more values the place of God's presence will become the most holy. Now this secret of God is so entirely disclosed by Him, after this manner of reserve, that the difference of regard which men feel for Churches, is as great as the difference of estimation in which our Lord was regarded by the beloved disciple or by the traitor Judas, for both of them were in His presence, but one only derived benefit from it. For instance, David speaks of the temple of God with words of longing desire, as great as could be expressed for any conceivable blessing, as being the place of God's presence; and yet many of us doubtless feel nothing of the kind. These gifts therefore, the greatest that heart of man can devise, are in secret; it is the kingdom of heaven upon earth, but seen only by certain persons; a treasure hid, "the pure in heart seeing God" under those veils: of all of which it may be said, as of our Lord's teaching, "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

3. Sacraments, Church Ordinances and practices.

In the next place, with respect to the Holy Sacraments, it is in these, and by these chiefly, that the Church of all ages has held the Doctrine of the Atonement after a certain manner of reserve; which sense of things this modern system has relinquished, and in consequence has put forward this doctrine to the people in a manner unknown to former ages. The Church has ever thus held the doctrine in its substance, in its fulness, in its life-giving power and reality: for which these moderns have substituted what is human;—the declaration of it by eloquence of speech, the reception of it in excitement of feeling. The Church considers it in the Sacraments as a power of substantial and Divine efficacy, conferring spiritual gifts and privileges; this system, as

nominal and external to ourselves. In the Sacraments the doctrine is most intimately and closely blended with the life and conduct of man ; in this system, it is in great measure separated from it. For instance, all ancient Baptismal Services, as well as that of our own Church, have most closely connected with the doctrine of the Atonement, the consideration of our being crucified with CHRIST, being dead with CHRIST, being buried with CHRIST, and the consequent necessity of our mortifying our earthly members : in this respect, they exemplify, in a wonderful manner, all that we have stated respecting this doctrine in the Gospels, and the Epistles of St. Paul, wherein our own cross,—the world being crucified to us, and we to the world,—is mysteriously connected with that of CHRIST. The Sacraments realize the doctrine in a way that no human system can do ; for we believe that a Divine Power, and the blessings of the Atonement especially, are, after some transcendental manner, present in those Sacraments, according to the express promise of our LORD. And it is very obvious that our Communion Service does support the same principle in like manner with the Baptismal Offices ; for it throughout implies penitence, faith, and charity as indispensable on the part of man ; and “the body and the blood of CHRIST, verily and indeed taken and received,” as the highest of gifts on the part of God. And these it considers as the spiritual life of Christians. And as the very essence of a Church does depend on a due dispensation of the blessed Sacraments, so, where a sense of these is impaired, or not realized by faith, the doctrine of the Atonement itself is put forth to mankind, as if the preaching of this constituted all that was life-giving in the Church. Now here it is very evident at once that the great difference between these two systems, consists in this, that one holds the doctrine secretly as it were, and the other openly, in a public and popular manner ; one in connexion with all other doctrines of Scripture, the other as separated from them. It is always the case with the Church, that it has considered the Sacraments as certain veils of the Divine presence, being not only the signs and tokens, but vehicles and conveyances, as it were, of Divine gifts. This is obvious, not only from the Discipline of the secret, but from usual

modes of speaking concerning them. Thus, St. Augustin (on Ps. xviii. v. 11.) on the words, "He laid in the darkness His secret place," applies this to God having laid His secret place "in the obscurity of the Sacrament, and secret hope in the heart of believers;" "where He Himself might be hid, and desert them not: even in this darkness, where we walk as yet by faith, not by sight." (Tom. iv. 107.)

The same may be shown with respect to the powers of Priestly Absolution, and the gifts conferred thereby. It is not required for our purpose to show the reality of that power, and the magnitude of those gifts which are thus dispensed. But a little consideration will show, that if the Church of all ages is right in exercising these privileges, the subject is one entirely of this reserved and mystical character. Its blessings are received in secret, according to faith: they are such as the world cannot behold, and cannot receive. The subject is one so profound and mysterious, that it hardly admits of being put forward in a popular way, and perhaps more injury than benefit would be done to religion by doing so inconsiderately. And yet a faithful Christian may look through the actions and offices of the Church, to that which is beyond human senses, to CHRIST absolving, CHRIST baptizing, CHRIST interceding, CHRIST pronouncing benediction; and may thus by an habitual sense of Absolution declared, come to the state of that penitent, who "loved much, because she had much forgiven." The same may be said with respect to the Benediction: no words and arguments, no learned proofs nor eloquent demonstration, of the blessing that is through these channels conveyed, render us of ourselves capable of receiving them; but it is a secret which God Himself dispenses as men are found worthy. For when our SAVIOUR instructed His disciples to pronounce the blessing of peace beyond understanding, He annexed to it, "that if the Son of peace be there, His peace should rest upon that house, if not, it should return to them again." And that His peace was mysteriously powerful to convey what it expressed, and not like mere human words of salutation, nor in a manner capable of being understood by the world, our Lord seems to have signified in that expression, "Peace be unto you,

My peace I give, not as the world giveth give I unto you." And that some blessing would be in reality attached to the authoritative declaration, might be inferred from the promise, attached to the Levitical Benediction, which God vouchsafed should be accompanied by His own blessing. To the heart of faith, therefore, the Priestly pronouncement of blessing, may be productive of greater spiritual benefit than the most moving appeals of human eloquence: as God is in secret, and His Angels that minister to us, and all His paths in the deep waters, so all His instruments of benefiting our souls seem to partake of this character of Reserve; ways that appear foolishness to the world, for its effects are out of sight, but seen and fully acknowledged by those who are brought to the sense of them, for "wisdom is justified of her own children."

The like may be shown in many other points, that "the weapons of our warfare being not carnal," partake of this secret character, in opposition to that system which we condemn. It is the custom of that system to recommend persons to seek those ministers which are supposed edifying; but the Church considers all edification to be of God, and by His own means. If they are found unworthy or inadequate, the world recommends us to attach ourselves to others; the Church, by her Ember Weeks, supplies a remedy, but entirely of a secret character. For as our Lord has said, when He beheld the people as sheep without a shepherd, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that he may send more labourers into his harvest;" therefore, it is clear that the remedy for the unworthiness or scantiness of ministers depends on the prayers of the people. Here again the Church supplies us with a quiet rule of Reserve: the opposite to that which this system extensively pursues.

There is another point which may be mentioned to show the way in the which the Church secretly realizes the doctrines of Scripture, which doctrines the world will not allow. The modern scheme is very careful to separate the cross of Christians from the Cross of Christ, which the Scriptures, we think, in mysterious and manifold ways, unite, in the same way that type and prophecy often combine allusions to Christ and to His members. Now,

consider the Friday fast with respect to this subject. The Church has always set apart this day for meditation on CHRIST's death and passion. But how is it to be observed? first of all it is a matter of obedience; in the next place the Church requires fasting on this day, both of which are in fact the bearing of our own cross. And now to take the simple matter of fact, in this case fasting and obedience is what would be called bearing our own cross, and the effect of this is to dispose the heart to prayer, and to heavenly affections, and a sense of God's mercy in CHRIST; thus, as Bishop Wilson observes, "the mystery of the cross is learned under the cross." Nor can this day be rightly observed excepting in such a manner as leads to these affections. Something of the same kind may be said respecting the LORD's day, on which the Antient Church used to observe the posture of standing in prayer, to express that we are risen together with CHRIST. To realize the Christian Sunday is a matter of faith, and requires a knowledge of the "power of the Resurrection:" to insist on the observance of the Jewish Sabbath is to insist on an external duty, and may be popularly expedient; it comes more among things of sight; the former is received by faith in the invisible sanctions of long Tradition; the latter insisted on by express legal sanction.

Again, the mode in which the Church teaches us to regard Holy Scripture is one of Reserve. Let us take for instance, the use of Psalms in daily public worship; by this circumstance of thus using them, it is evident she considers them as a Christian manual of devotion. And yet modern systems, which disparage or separate from the Church, consider them as very unfit for such a purpose. The Church uses them entirely upon a principle of reserve: for of course, for a Christian to be repeating expressions concerning war, "the shield, the sword, and the battle," or concerning legal sacrifices, "offering bullocks and goats," or of "the hill of Sion," and the mountains that surrounded Jerusalem; or of Sihon king of the Amorites, and Og the king of Bashan; or of Edom and Babylon being laid even with the ground: all these things are of course (as Dr. Watts has stated them to be) unfit words for a Christian, excepting upon this principle of re-

serve ; according to which we believe that the inspiration of God is in the words, and reverence them as full of Divine meanings with respect to ourselves. Something after the same manner that we look upon a Church and altar as holy, though to bodily eyes they are nothing more than cold stones or bare wood. And after some faint imitation of this vast principle of reserve, which thus pervades the Church of God, it is supposed that even the visible shape and structure of sacred edifices was intended by our forefathers to represent sacred mysteries, and the higher doctrines of our faith. Indeed, the Lessons themselves which are read in Divine worship are many of them not at all understood by some, by most very imperfectly. Hence this popular system will not allow this reading of Holy Scripture to be sufficient for maintaining their opinions, without also what they call the "preaching of the Word," by which it is implied, that the Scriptures themselves are not the Word in the sense in the which they use the term. Because they do not put forward prominently and explicitly on all occasions the doctrine they regard.

But moreover, with regard to the doctrine of the Atonement, it is contained throughout the whole of the Liturgy, after this manner of sacred reserve : inasmuch as the whole tone, spirit, and character of it, and especially the Litany, is expressive of this doctrine ; and in fact conveys it, teaches it, infuses a right sense of it, more vitally and truly than any set speeches could do, in the same way that it is taught by all our Lord's words and actions. So that they of her sons whose spirit is in unison with her prayers, rightly receive this great cardinal truth : they whose spirit is not thus in accordance with her cannot receive it rightly.

4. The Church realizes the Kingdom in secret.

Now to realize all these mysterious blessings contained in the Church were, indeed, to understand the meaning of the term by which it is designated in Scripture as "the kingdom of Heaven" upon earth. It is all founded on that vast principle in Religion, that "he who will do the will, shall know of the doctrine." They are all things that depend on the state of the heart : they

cannot be otherwise than real and substantial gifts as they have reference entirely to God's unseen presence, and only thus attained by secret faith and obedience. Now, some persons will allow that the case is perfectly true respecting our Lord's conduct in the flesh, that He observed this reserve (as shown in Tract 80. part i.) but they would confine it to that alone : they may be asked then, whether the case of the Church in all these respects is not perfectly analogous to it: our Lord is present in His Church according to His promise, and in all these things as of old, "He doth not strive, nor cry, nor lift up His voice in the streets."

We have in these points endeavoured to show more especially that the Church holds, after a living and substantial manner, those great truths of our Lord's Divinity and Atonement: she holds in secret what others require to be publicly pronounced aloud. But as the Church is more especially the dispensation of the SPIRIT, so it may be shown that she realizes, in the same kind of retiring modesty, all those influences of the SPIRIT connected with duty and dependence on the part of man, which it is thought so necessary publicly to profess. It is very evident how this is implied in the principle of the Church sacramentally conveying grace: not to all indiscriminately, but to those who duly watch and wait for those gifts. It might be shown in like manner, how each article in the third part of the Creed, respecting the dispensation of the SPIRIT, is found fulfilled in the Church after a living manner, and not in human plans of religion. "The Holy Catholic Church" is realized throughout it, all our principles and practices being thence derived, and holding us in union with her. "The Communion of Saints" is maintained by unity of worship, by similarity of devotional forms, by one Baptism, and also by her Saints' days; whereby various Churches throughout the world, by commemorating the same Saints, on the same days, preserve a communion of spirit with the living, and also with the dead, whom they commemorate. "The Forgiveness of sins," is taught by her Sacraments, and Absolution. "The Resurrection of the body," by the doctrine of the Eucharist, as always considered to have some mysterious connection with the resurrection of our bodies: by the reverential regard with which she looks on Churchyards:

and the whole tone of her Liturgy and prayers, looks forward to "a life everlasting after death." So fully do her Services contain every doctrine and every principle which has a reference to the Holy Spirit: and as far as her sons, by faith and obedience, realize the same, they obtain the blessings of the Spirit; though the world knows not of it. And if the Church is reproached for not exhibiting these sacred truths more publicly, that reproach she shares with her Divine Founder and Master, to whom it was said, "If thou doest these things, show thyself to the world."

There are many points in which this sacred economy of the Church, being directed to the eye of God, and not to man, as one of reserve, is free from the temptations to which human systems are liable: it has no temptation to put forth principles of expediency rather than of truth, as that of Regeneration after Baptism: it is in a great degree independent of numbers;—are there few or many that hold them, it matters not: it is free from the temptation to party spirit; it needs no words, no professions, to collect others around in sympathy; to make "broad phylacteries," wearing without that which should be within: external ordinances serve the purpose of external bonds of union, and it thus secretly enters into the Communion of Saints. And, again, the House of God is, we know, "the House of Prayer," for the purposes of worship, but those whose religion mainly consists in popular appeals, are used to say, that the sight of a thinly-attended Church is perfectly deadening to them: and judging from their own feelings, they think it very desirable, that a Church should never be open, but when fully frequented: they need, moreover, external sympathies more for worship: but not so those who are used to realize, or endeavour to realize, in a Church, God's presence: where Angels are intermingled as their associates in worship. And it is remarkable, that the two systems, that of this sacred reserve, and that of popular expediency, cannot exist together, without one derogating from the other: in the same way that what is carnal, sensible, visible, has tendency to stifle that which is spiritual and invisible. Where preaching (or rather eloquence of speech) is too highly estimated, prayer and the sacraments must necessarily lose their value: spirits excited, and moved beyond

the tone of God's WORD, cannot enter in the calm and deep reality of the sacred services.

But it may be asked, if the principle of the Church is so much of this retiring character, how is she as well calculated to propagate the Gospel publicly, and extensively, in the world, as the more popular system, and to bring into CHRIST's fold His sheep that are scattered abroad ? To this it should be a sufficient answer, that these are the ways of God ; this is the point we maintain ; to which it may be added, that at that early period when this system was most of all observed in the Church, the Gospel spread itself throughout the earth in a manner quite beyond any subsequent example : for as they then carefully inculcated that saving truths could not be known, but by obedience and faith, they preserved that unity to which the blessing is attached. But it may be explained in this manner, how it is that the Church, under this veil of reserve, must necessarily be more powerful than any human modes or principles of extending the faith. For all the means we have spoken of, as belonging to the Church, are ways of obtaining holiness of life and God's favour : and the obedience of Christians is the light of the world ; example the most powerful of persuasions. But besides these, preaching, catechising, and all such means directed to mankind, obtain their greatest efficacy from holiness of life. And the point we have endeavoured to show in popular systems, is their want of real efficacy ; that expediency in things Divine is the worst policy : for surely the ways of God are more powerful than those of man, though it is impossible they should appear so to mankind, as they are spiritually and morally discerned. A faithful Church is necessarily a converting Church, for it is of itself, " a city set on a hill that cannot be hid," the true Bethlehem, from which CHRIST goeth forth publicly, though there hid in secret : the true Bethlehem, the house of bread, which is the Church, the city of God. Though it be silent, if that were possible, yet in holy reserve it preaches aloud ; " though there be neither speech nor language, yet their voices are heard among them."

When our LORD in the Sermon on the Mount, after laying down the laws of evangelical righteousness, proceeded to give

directions respecting the three modes by which power should be obtained to fulfil His laws, viz. by Prayer and Almsgiving and Fasting, He confined those regulations especially by the law of secrecy, commanding that they were to be done in secret, with reference alone to our FATHER, who seeth in secret, and will reward openly. It seems not unnatural to think that in these He spoke (according to the vastness of Divine words) of what must be the essential character of His Church, as therein all duties are by faith to be directed to Him who dwelleth in secret: and there is something of a reward which is openly promised in this world (in prelude to the manifestation hereafter), in that, from the strength thus derived in secret, the example shines before men, who are able to see the good works, and by their own conversion by these means, glorify God.

And thus, if there are persons living in the fear of God, and entirely given up to the things that are unseen, and making great sacrifices to do so, (which has been the purpose with whole bodies of Christians in religious houses) not only by the prevailing power of their prayers, and such means as are known to God only, but as a witness, their efficacy is most powerful in supporting a sense of piety in the world. Such a religion, which has its anchor in the invisible world, is not moved by the storms of this: a city which has its foundation on the eternal hills, and standeth fast like the great mountains. In contrast to which, this modern system, partaking of the character of our own age of expediency, and mostly founded on feeling, is moved by every wind; it partakes of the weakness of human things, and cannot stand when the floods arise. For surely it must be allowed that it consists, not in Sacraments, not in gifts of God bestowed on His chosen, not in Divinely appointed Ordinances, not in Liturgical Services, not in prayer, not in obedience, not in the strong holds of the eternal world, and the secret strength of God: but in words and phrases, in professions and emotions, in popular appeals, and party zeal: in confounding all distinctions between the Church of God and all the sects that prevail among misguided men. Very tenderly as we must wish to speak of individuals that adopt it, (some of whom are in fact but attempt-

ing to realize the substance of great Christian truths which have been forgotten) yet, surely we must see that this religious system has about it something which falls in with, and encourages, nay, assumes its own character and complexion from, that spirit of disobedience and lawlessness, which is to prevail in the last days.

5. *The best preservative of sound principles.*

But it may be asked, do not those who bring forward the doctrines of the Church among ourselves, act in a manner at variance with this principle? It is sincerely hoped that they have not done so. They have indeed put forth the highest and most sacred doctrines, respecting the regenerating power of Baptism, and the sacrifice of the blessed Eucharist, matters beyond all others of sacred reserve, and the discipline of the secret. But they have done so by constraint, as bearing witness, which they were bound to do most distinctly and fully, to principles and doctrines of the Church, vitally important, but very much forgotten, and even denied by many, not only of Christians in general, but also of her ministers. And this they have done, not so much in popular discourses as in argumentative treatises, directed for the most part to the clergy : and not, it is hoped, without some sense and due reverence for their importance ; certainly not in a manner to move the feelings and render them popular, by separating them from other distasteful truths, but with those accompanying doctrines, which have a tendency to make both those that hear and those that speak, serious. Those especially (or we might speak in the singular number) who have brought forward these two great doctrines just mentioned, might have met with a more favourable reception from the world, had they not associated with them other subjects equally forgotten, and naturally unpopular and unwelcome, such as the danger of sin after Baptism, the necessity of mortification, the doctrine of Judgment to come. Surely if any thing would dispose men to speak of those high doctrines of the Sacraments with reverential reserve, and to hear of them with seriousness, it is their connec-

tion with these subjects : not that they have been thus connected with any designed intention of this kind, but that they have naturally gone together, from the spontaneous acting of those who felt the importance of what they said, and have therefore, as it were accidentally, fallen in with the Scriptural mode of teaching. Had all religious matters been treated with this spirit, there would have been no need for the subject of this Tract. That these Church principles should be received by others with this spirit, is perhaps, in this age, scarcely to be expected : and yet, from the absence of it, are to be apprehended all those evils which we have deprecated under a different form.

The one and sole end of all that has been taught respecting the Church, is simply to point out the means of obtaining and continuing in God's favour, during our stay in this world, and being accepted of Him for the sake of JESUS CHRIST at last, and escaping the sad doom that awaits the impenitent world. If considered in any other point of view they are thoroughly unprofitable and vain, of no more worth than the idle speculations of the day, the schemes of business, and plans of politics, merely specious theories respecting things most holy, which may touch the fancy with their transcendent beauty, and amuse the imagination, but leave the heart worldly, and pride unsubdued : nay, with regard to a better world, they are in such a case not merely unprofitable, but they may become snares to delude the conscience, and leave us at last, like all earthly things, with a shadow in our hands, having for ever lost the substance.

For in proportion as they are themselves holy and true and life-giving, they must necessarily be dangerous in their abuse. But now, if this one end and aim is the most rare thing in the world to obtain, the very last thing to be expected of creatures corrupt and inclined to evil as we are, then, of course, it is to be feared, that these principles may be perverted to other than these the highest of all purposes. At all events, if they should spread and become popular in the world, then of course one would fear, that they are not taught, or at all events not received, in their purity : one would apprehend that there was something wrong ;

or possibly, if such holy principles are received without a change of life, it may be but the raising of that temple of God, in which Antichrist will sit, and exalt himself at last.

For as every thing is difficult in proportion to its excellence and value, very difficult therefore must it be to enter into the fulness of these blessings, which these doctrines of the Church contain. For instance, if we take the subject of prayer, the spirit and temper and practice of prayer being more essentially that of the Church Catholic; how difficult is it to pray aright; so much so, that it were not too much to say, that it requires the very utmost stretch of our endeavours, the perfection of our highest faculties, the labour of a long life, to learn to pray. The very best of men are but learners in this art, and become most sensible of their deficiencies. How much more so must it be to realize also the Divine Sacraments, and attain unto the greatness of their efficacy. Such indeed were to understand the meaning of Divine words, which speak of the Church as a "kingdom of Heaven;" it were to be indeed a heaven upon earth. And in the progressive attainment of that knowledge, "*blessed is he that feareth always.*"

The less therefore that these most holy doctrines are received into the heart, the more loudly will they be spoken of: Divine fear, like Divine love, has ever about it this natural modesty: it has little to say, its chief language is that of prayer, and that in secret: as all its ways are directed to One who seeth in secret, it is ever fearful of man's praise, and fearless of his reproach.

Those who most value sacred things will in general say least about them: admiration indeed and joy will find a voice, and a spontaneous expression, as the shepherds published abroad what they had heard of the Angels and seen: but yet in such eloquence there will always be a natural reserve. And even these feelings, when increased greatly and fixed very deeply, will be silent: the shepherds spake, but Mary was silent, she "*kept these things and pondered them in her heart.*"

Disputation, says Hooker, speaking of the Eucharist, is a sign

of a want of love, and perhaps a sign of a want of faith also, for it was something of a disputatious spirit, that St. Thomas evinced, when he said that he must feel and handle. Whenever, also, there is a secret doubt of an opinion which we wish to entertain, there is a disposition to dispute and persuade, in order that by obtaining the persuasions of others, we may establish our own convictions. This may be seen in the origin of the doctrine of Transubstantiation: it arose in a dereliction and forgetfulness of the discipline of reserve on that subject; in a want of the high and ancient reverence; in a desire to establish and prove to the world a great secret of God. The result was profaneness in both parties. Not only in the denial of Sacramental grace on the one side, but in the low and carnal conceit which Transubstantiation introduced. So awful in its consequences has been the attempt to bring out the doctrine of the Eucharist from the holy silence, which adoring reverence suggests; the attempt of the human understanding with unhallowed boldness to fathom the deep things of God; to circumscribe the Ineffable, who hath made His pavilion in dark water, with thick clouds to cover Him; to look into the ark of God; to pry into those secret things which the ALMIGHTY has reserved unto Himself. The Primitive Church thought otherwise, as of a doctrine to be realized by devotion, rather than capable of being expressed in human language; considering it impossible for human reason to define its nature, or to think and speak worthily of that which is Divine. It is no part of our duty to censure the state of other Churches, but where, for our own protection, Christian wisdom and charity require it. And it is worthy of observation, that, in the Church of Rome, that which is Roman and Tridentine, in distinction from that which is Catholic, is characterized by a want of this reserve. The want of reserve and reverence which attends the elevation of the Host, and the public processions connected with it, is very great indeed: these are indications (like many things of a different nature in the system we have condemned) that it is popular impression, and not a sense of God's presence, which is considered: for here there can be no true veneration; and "where God is, there must be the fear of Him." They are of

the nature of religious frauds ; it is effect which is more thought of than truth.

The same may be shown in many other circumstances of their religion : it is indeed the Catholic Church, but decked out with tinsel and false ornaments to catch the eye ; like a statue of purest marble painted and besmeared, till scarce a vestige of its true substance is seen. Consider, for instance, their sacred edifices : the Church holds these to be worthy of the deepest veneration as the places of God's peculiar presence ; and the altar more especially. But what is to be said of tawdry decorations of Churches and sacred things ? would we wish to see any human being that we venerated and respected thus meretriciously adorned ? It is an attempt at comparatively little cost to catch the eye, very unlike that ancient religion which is costly, and chaste, and simple ; which would gladly be poor in this world, that it may offer to God what is most worthy and valuable, and cares not, but in a secondary manner, for the effect on mankind ; for we always look to that which we most love.

In these things to look to God will lead us to the reserve of a sacred simplicity : ostentatious singularity and display is a looking to man. To know God in His holy places ; to know God in His Sacraments, in His Word, in prayer, is the kingdom of Heaven. But if the Israelites could fall away with the pillar of fire before them, and the destruction of the Egyptians behind ; if, in the light of the Baptist's teaching, men could " rejoice for a season only ;" and could eat of the loaves from our SAVIOUR'S hands, and yet deny Him ; we have more reason to fear for the abuse of sacred truth, than presume on its being revived among us.

And how are the many evils to be avoided which we would guard against ? To say that we are always to be reverent on sacred things, to speak with reverence, to act with reverence, surely this will not produce what we want ; but rather the very opposite ; for to put on the appearance of reverence for example's sake, or for the edification of others, were but the very thing which we condemn, and were no better than formal hypocrisy. All that can be said is, not to seek to remedy by external effects,

that which can only be from within ; to think less of appearance, more of the reality ; to be natural, serious, forbearing, as considering what, and where we are, and what we are coming to.

6. *Caution necessary with respect to the latent senses of Scripture.*

There is another subject which necessarily must attract much attention, as men's minds are turned more to Theology : and which comes on this generation with all the attractions, and all the dangers, of novelty ; and that is, the depth and vastness of type, analogy, and prophecy contained in God's Word. Now with regard to these things it must be remembered, that attention to them has been revived by persons of some experience, and some reading ; and the right and true understanding of such subjects, the Fathers, to whom they refer us, speak of as being the result of a life of devotion and piety. Such, for instance, is the knowledge of these mystical and deeper senses of Scripture ; they consider them to be disclosed to prayer rather than acuteness, to experience rather than study ; to piety rather than learning. But of course there is no reason why these should not become matters for mere speculative inquiry, and curious research : they are at once highly attractive and pleasing to the imagination : the analogies of Scripture open new worlds to the mind, like discoveries in the material Heavens, and may excite the curiosity we derive from our fallen parents. The accurate closeness of its phrases, is like the nice formation in each flower of the field : its light like the body of the Heavens in its clearness ; its vastness like the bosom of the sea ; its variety like scenes of nature. Nothing, therefore, can be more captivating, more sublime, more engaging ; tempting the mind by its indefiniteness to fresh pursuits, and new inquiries ; and from thence to speculate, to talk, to be eloquent, on such points ; to make even them also matters of display. Here, therefore, the reserve of natural piety will be broken, for these are not the uses for which God's revealed Word was intended, but only that we might come to the knowledge of Him and of ourselves.

One thing is certain, that the deep senses and hidden knowledge of Scripture, are intended to enlighten the heart and exercise the affections, not to gratify the intellect or try the ingenuity. With regard to any knowledge that is truly valuable, the unhallowed intellect can of itself learn nothing. As in all other matters, in His Providences, His moral government, in the events of life, and the thoughts of man's mind, God will reveal Himself only to the pure in heart, to the humble, and such as keep His commandments : so also in His written Word, He will manifest Himself to such only. He will disclose Himself to each in that particular way, perhaps, in which they reverently seek Him ; to one in exercises of devotion ; to another in acts of charity ; to another in the practice of humiliation ; to another in the religious fulfilment of practical duties ; to another in the study of Holy Scripture. Not that either of these can be pursued exclusively to the neglect of the others, for he, who breaks one law of his Christian calling, is guilty of all : but as the peculiar sphere of each is regulated by the great Disposer of all, so the line which is appointed unto each, is that course which, if rightly pursued, will lead him to God, and to the manifestation of some one of His attributes, which are variously disclosed to each. To search out and study in Holy Scripture nothing more than the beauty of its analogies, the strength and depth of its figures, the harmony of its proportions, and its perfection as a whole, were indeed but a poor and barren study of itself alone : and poor would be its reward, if it could attain unto the greatest skill in this knowledge. It would be like scientific studies in the natural world, which, if exclusively pursued, will, we know, draw away the heart from God, and not nearer to Him. But if they are pursued at every step in a thorough dependence on Him, from whom alone cometh down every good and perfect gift ; with a devout acknowledgment of His perfections whenever they are disclosed ; and a desire to know Him, in order to serve and worship Him better ; then, no doubt, He will through these studies impart that wisdom, to the attainment of which St. Paul so earnestly exhorts his Ephesian converts, that knowledge which is one with faith ;—these two being as closely united with each other

as light and heat, the one illuminating, and the other quickening the soul after some heavenly manner. The knowledge of Holy Scripture, which is thus life-giving, may be ever progressive, leading more and more into hidden riches and treasures : the promise is given, and to him who knocks at the door by humble prayer, it will infallibly be opened. And he will still have to knock again at the door, and be admitted again into the inner shrine of ever-increasing light ; and as he advances onward into better knowledge, and more light, he will see himself more and more deformed and unsightly, until, at length, he will wish to be entirely withdrawn from the sight of man, and to be hidden with God.

Now, if we study Scripture with this single eye, under the guidance of God's good SPIRIT, we shall so far be preserved and protected by this sacred modesty ; it will prevent us from exposing the treasures of God, or His secret gifts ; and will suggest to us, that so far as we are truly desirous to do good to others, we shall observe towards them this forbearance, according as their case requires. We shall have no need of a system, for we shall do it naturally : the example of St. Paul on this subject of the mystical senses of Scripture is quite sufficient ; he does not, we may suppose, set himself any system or rule of secrecy ; on which account his example is of more weight in always observing it : as it shows that it is a law of natural piety, which the HOLY SPIRIT has stamped on our souls. So that if any body be otherwise minded, and yet is seeking His heavenly guidance, He will reveal even this unto him, so that " he will walk by the same rule, he will mind the same thing." For consider St. Paul's reserve in the Epistle to the Hebrews on the subject of Melchisedec : how different is his conduct to that which the modern wisdom of expediency would suggest ? These mystical prophecies in the Old Testament, so long secretly contained in it respecting the Messiah, so distinct and so minute, must, (it might have been thought) if publicly brought forward, have struck these carnally-minded Hebrews very much ; such wonderful circumstances, couched in such apparently accidental mention, in a book written at so early an age, would have been a great confirmation of their

faith, and would have inspired them with awe for the sacred volume, and for the person of CHRIST, for whose coming there had been such solemn and so long preparation ; and how (might it have been urged) would it have increased their awe for the Holy Eucharist to find the allusion to it contained in this passage in Genesis. But St. Paul thought otherwise. It is precisely in the same manner that we might have supposed our LORD's fully disclosing Himself would have been so beneficial to the unbelieving Jews. But the conduct of our LORD and of His Apostles is perfectly analogous : and that of the Fathers on the same subject is so similar, that we cannot but suppose it is by the same SPIRIT. We may, indeed, sometimes speak of these things publicly : and may even enlarge on the sacred mysteries of the most blessed Eucharist, (which is so awfully depreciated) but afterwards we shall, I think, feel some misgiving, some instinctive feeling, as if reverence was hurt : in such cases, a man's own mind will tell him more than ten men that stand on a watch-tower. Though of course, they who have to combine theological studies with popular teaching, will often find some difficulty on this subject, which St. Augustine describes himself as struggling with.

7. Secret religious duties, conversation, and controversy.

There is another point, in which it would seem that the Roman Church of late years has outstepped the retiring nature of Christian piety, to the great injury of the religious character, viz. in the observation of fast days, which has become very external, and looks too much to human obligation : thereby bringing in some degree into the sanctuary of God, the unsanctifying eye of man. On this subject, therefore, we require to be reminded of our LORD's sacred injunction of a reserved secrecy. We would, of course, keep the fasts of the Church religiously and scrupulously, for as Bishop Wilson says, Woe be to that Christian, who knows not what it is to fast, even when the Church requires it. And with regard to the shame which men, and especially the young, are apt to feel at being thought under the subjection of rule and ordinances, we would take for our especial warning

those awful words, "Whosoever is ashamed of me and of my words of him shall the Son of man be ashamed." But when this shame is once overcome, if it be before the heart be humbled, and any thing is to be gained in the way of countenance or sympathy, there is a danger of a feeling being introduced alien to Christian delicacy, on this most delicate of all subjects. There are duties to the unseen, but ever-seeing God, and expressions of love to Him ; and what an exceedingly delicate thing this love is ? what a breath of air seems to sully it, how it shrinks from the light of common day ? This may be seen in Mr. James Bonnell's treatment of himself on these points ; how does his own moral feeling exemplify our SAVIOUR's very remarkable and particular directions on the subject of these duties. It is indeed true, that the observance of these things is so out of fashion, that a public warning, and a public profession of them is almost needful : but such public testimonies, while they are necessary, are painful ; and when they cease to be painful, become a snare. The strength of truth is from its connexion with other worlds, and, therefore, is in secret ; "Thy words have I hid within my heart"—and why ? "That I should not sin against Thee." Or again, if we press these duties on others beyond what they are able to bear, or beyond what they may reasonably think our own sincerity will warrant, how may we rather repel than invite them ! the cause of truth may suffer in our hands. Let our private self-denial exceed, and precede, our public testimony.

Others again, may be half inclined to cast aside this reserve, from feelings of natural pride at the greatness of that high cause in which they are interested ; in which the best names of all ages have been engaged. There is, moreover, something of refinement and good taste connected with the highest principles, which it is honourable to be associated with ; these may tempt some to be too forward in so holy a cause, too forward in externally maintaining, far too backward in practically realizing them. But, above all, there is a humble quietness in all these retiring ways of seeking God ; whereas our natural tempers seek for excitement, and press forward to something beyond.

Such persons, who are tempted to feel as if they were supporters

of, rather than supported by, the Church, her friends rather than her disciples, should be requested to consider, what it is to be supporting the cause of the Holy Catholic Church, and that of great and good men. Who are we, that we should venture to do so ? It is our highest honour to be supposed capable of a lively interest for the former, and to be allied in sympathy with the latter. It is a privilege and high favour we may well aspire to. But are we in our lives and habits worthy to take this upon us ; may we not by doing so, bring discredit, by our favour and zeal, on that sacred cause ? Is there not something of presumption in venturing too freely to connect our names with theirs ? Here again, do we not require a certain reserve and modesty, to keep us faithful. Servants about a king's presence, may be proud of that nearness, and of the company that it brings them into ; but they venture not to speak of this ; but in the exact fulfilment of their duties are more zealous not to be found wanting. We know that Sir Matthew Hale was cautious not to be too much thought religious, lest he should fall into sin, and so bring discredit on the cause of God : is not something of this feeling a right and good one, with respect to the great principles and great names which our profession may bring into disrepute by some fault ? And besides, surely our great object must be to cherish in ourselves deep and quiet principles ; to strengthen in ourselves more and more a right and adequate sense of what we believe, rather than to hold them externally and disputatiously. A desire for disputation, is no sign of a regard for truth : how much the habit of looking at things with this view, eats out the seriousness and delicacy of Christian piety, is too sadly evident in the Roman controversialists. Deep waters are still and unruffled, and scarce perceptible in their motion to the ear and eye : shallow streams are noisy and disturbed.

But as on this, and some other points to which this subject refers, there have existed strange misapprehensions, or rather, it must be said, vague suspicions of some meaning neither expressed nor intended, it seems requisite to say a little more distinctly, what it is which has been neither taught nor meant.

It will be observed, that nothing whatever is said in this treatise to recommend our forming a system of reserve, nor our watching over ourselves to suppress the natural expression of what we revere and love, nor our forming a close society for the freer communication of religious sentiments: but that we endeavour above all things to cherish in ourselves a habit of reverence, that we speak as truth dictates, and speak naturally. What has been said, has been put forth defensively;—in order to show that the assuming of a religious tone, is so far from being necessary, that it is highly to be deprecated, as injurious to ourselves and others; that in an age which looks so much to effect and appearance, we must thoroughly study truth and reality. No rule of silence need perhaps be even thought of by a simple-minded piety, that has not dimmed the light within, nor lost the single eye. But few of us are of this kind. It has been shown in the former treatise to be rather the unavoidable effect in good men, under the teaching of God's good SPIRIT, than any thing to be recommended as a rule; because all we say is, that such reserve is natural, and that, where it is lost, religion has lost its best protection and its strength. We have only to repeat, therefore, our former admonition, (Tract 80. Part iii.) that we follow in this as in all other matters our LORD's example, who was ever watching to do good, never ostentatiously and unnecessarily obtruding religion; and, as it were, ever spoke naturally.

The fact is, that this is one of the many subjects in which we have to go back, and learn of children; there is remarkable in children, together with that openness and freedom which accompanies simplicity and singleness of heart, that modesty also and reserve which is here inculcated; it is one of the most beautiful and interesting traits of that age: like the bloom on the flower; when this is spoiled in children they have lost the highest hopes we can entertain of them; it is one of the first indications of the loss of innocence.

It must also be observed, that there are among mankind great constitutional diversities of temper and character, which render the same free expressions of their sentiments, in some perfectly natural, which would be far from being so in another. So far,

therefore, as it is natural, it will not offend against this rule of modesty ; but, of course, being the teaching of God, will be the best means to promote the cause of His truth.

Certain it is, notwithstanding, that persons of deep feeling and seriousness of mind have thought it requisite to prescribe to themselves rules of reserve ; have felt, that when they have not done so they have injured their better mind, and it has been a subject of regret to them. Now the statement of this principle should be a protection to such, that they should not be harshly and inconsiderately judged for so doing.

And indeed, in such cases, the reserve of a reverential and thoughtful character is of itself the most emphatic language, this silence the strongest eloquence of affection. This even nature dictates on the common law of our poor earthly affections,—

“Incipit effari, mediâque in voce resistit.”

Even Heathen piety, in holy places, and on subjects that are holy, would say, *εὐφημεῖτε*, which expression, though it literally implied “use words of good,” was piously interpreted to mean silence or reserve, and a guard on the thoughts. And doubtless that is a healthful and right feeling, which quite shrinks from an *affectation* of religious discourse : “it is quite nauseous,” says Bishop Butler : *τότ' εἰπεῖν εὐπρεπὲς μύσασμα πῶς*, says the Greek Poet (*Æsc. Suppl.* 995.) Such a practice must be very injurious. Even where sacred principles are truly cherished, this natural reserve strengthens, tries, and matures them, when they have to make their way through difficulties, and are not fully explained ; whereby they show themselves in fruit rather than leaves, in action rather than words. “Be swift to hear,” says Holy Scripture, “slow to speak ;” “be ready to give an answer with *meekness and fear*, to him who asks a reason of your hope.”

The subject ought also to suggest to us some little forbearance with regard to matters of disputation and controversy. If, where truth is (according to the often repeated remark of Tertullian), “there God is, and where God is, there must be the fear of Him,” we have to apprehend the worst consequences from that prevailing

irreverence in religion, which it has been the object of this treatise to call attention to ; and it makes it incumbent on each to look to himself. With regard to controversial disputations, either in discourse or writing, where the object can scarcely be conceived to be a sincere desire of knowing the truth, surely we should thoughtfully weigh our Lord's example, and His very remarkable silence on many occasions, or His indirect answer, and that under the strongest accusations. "The chief Priests accused Him of many things, but He answered nothing; and Pilate asked Him again, saying, answerest Thou nothing? behold how many things they witness against Thee. But Jesus yet answered nothing, so that Pilate marvelled." This silence, says St. Jerome, expiates the excuses of Adam: and Origen has spoken of it as the example, which we are to follow in attacks on our faith, except where the circumstances call for a reply. We may observe throughout our Lord's exceeding watchfulness (so to speak) to meet every desire of knowing the truth in those around Him, and how, from His knowledge of their hearts, He often anticipated their expressions ; how continually, even with those who were not thus desirous, He kept suggesting thoughts, which, if pursued, might serve them as a clue to their arriving at the truth, or would remove their prejudices. But with regard to entering into their captious difficulties, or answering their unreasonable accusations, He appears to have avoided it, and patiently submitted, although their false or falsely coloured charges were loud in the ears of others, "committing Himself unto Him who judgeth righteously."

It is moreover too evident, how many things come in to instigate to controversial attacks and disputations, besides a regard for the truth : how much of self, how much of careless inattention to the whole matter in dispute ; what slowness to comprehend, combined with determination to deny. Persons will often admit accidentally and unconsciously their knowledge of that truth which their arguments are intended to controvert. It is the state of the heart in such matters which is to be changed ; a mind set earnestly on the attainment of truth itself will avoid such disputations ; and therefore perhaps it is told us, that though we are to be "ever

112 *Untenable objections on the ground of our present position.*

ready to give an answer to Him that asketh," and we may add to Him who desireth, "*with meekness and fear*:" that the servant of the LORD must be "gentle and apt to teach;" yet it is said that he "must not strive." Foolish and unlearned questionings avoid, knowing that they gender strifes," is St. Paul's advice to the Christian minister. In the case of infidelity in the nearest of relatives, it is enjoined, that such may be gained over without argument, by "beholding chaste conversation, coupled with fear." To take a very strong instance of that subtle and secret hypocrisy which we have been speaking of, we all know that there are instances of persons standing forth as the public champions of a Church, or some form of faith, whose lives deny their belief in the very existence of a God. Let us take care that there be nothing of this, the same in kind, though less in degree, in ourselves.

8. *Untenable objections on the ground of our present position.*

But there are some objections to this treatise, of a very obvious and simple kind, which it is difficult to know how to answer, as they arise from a strange misapprehension *in limine* of the nature of the subject: objections which, as was stated before, are necessarily implied in the very word revelation. It is thought, for instance, that the command, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel unto every creature," is an insurmountable objection to the whole argument. Whereas, it should be considered, that the whole matter under consideration is, not whether the Gospel is to be preached or not, for of course there could be no doubt among Christians on that subject, but respecting the most effectual mode of preaching it: without taking this for granted as the first axiom among Christians, viz. that the Gospel is to be preached, the whole inquiry has no meaning.

With rather more appearance of reason it is alleged, that our Lord's conduct is no example for us in this case; as He has said, "what I tell you in the ear, that preach ye on the housetops;" and "men do not light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick, and it giveth light unto all that are in the

house." Now if there was any weight in these passages against this reserve, it would be merely that of one Scripture expression opposed to another ; for there are several commands in the same discourse of an opposite character ¹, and therefore of course they admit of explanation without contradicting each other. The obvious meaning of these passages of course is "Think not that My kingdom is to be confined, as now it is, to you few alone, it is to be preached to all the world ;" and such a declaration evidently does not interfere with this principle of holy reserve, as the guide and mode of doing this most sincerely and effectually. And indeed to the latter text it is added, as if showing us the way by which we were to extend the truth, "Let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works," as Chrysostom says, not of course that they were to display their works in any way, but that if they keep the fire burning within them, it necessarily must shine. And besides which it appears, on many occasions, when expressions of this kind are used ², that they have a reference also to the day of Judgment ; as if it had been said, "Wonder not that My ways are so much in secret, and that I require your works also to be done so much in secret, and unlike those of the Pharisees ; a time is coming when every thing whatever shall be publicly made known, to all men and angels." As if it were in some measure an explanation given, that that great manifestation will be a counterpart to this reserve.

But that these expressions respecting the general knowledge of the Gospel throughout the world, do in no way affect this rule of reserve, will be evident if we consider the various periods of the Divine economy as various manifestations of CHRIST. And it will be easily perceived that they are all characterized by this same law. First of all the term manifestation is applied to our Lord's appearing in the flesh ; it is applied to Him at His birth ; it is applied to the coming and calling of the Gentiles ;

¹ Thus St. Chrysostom observes, "Though it be every where preached, still it is a mystery ; for as we have been commanded '*what things we have heard in the ear, to speak upon the housetops,*' so have we been also charged, '*not to give the holy things unto dogs, nor yet to cast pearls before swine.*'" 1 Cor. Hom. vii. 3.

² St. Luke xii. 2 ; viii. 16, &c.

it is applied to the Presentation in the temple ; it is applied to our LORD at His Baptism : and to the first miracle He performed in Cana of Galilee. It is applied to Him more especially in His miracles and teaching. All these we celebrate in the Epiphany, as will be seen in the successive Gospels for that season ; but how secretly and mysteriously were they all conducted ? All these are manifestations of God seen in the flesh, our Immanuel. And all these are with this reserve. In like manner the preaching of the Gospel, and the extension of the Kingdom, are more fully manifestations of God ; but as in the former cases CHRIST was known and acknowledged but by a very few, notwithstanding those manifestations of Himself ; so is it now. It is evident that in some sense even now the manifestation of Himself must be according to some law of exceeding reserve and secrecy, for our LORD has said that if any man will keep His commandments He will love him, and will manifest Himself unto him ; that He would "manifest Himself to His disciples, and not unto the world." Now as it is too obvious that many do not keep His commandments, therefore to many He is not manifested. So that to us all, even now our LORD observes this rule of concealing Himself even in His manifestations ; and therefore all His manifestations in His Church are ways of reserve.

9. *This principle more than ever needed.*

But great surprise is expressed, because we have maintained that the spread of religious knowledge throughout the world renders it a matter for serious apprehension, lest we should abuse that knowledge. Surely, since to him who knoweth and doeth not to him it is sin, all knowledge of God should be accompanied with this apprehension. All things seem to be tending to the one great manifestation of God, in the day of Judgment, which will be in destruction as well as in salvation ; and therefore it may be, as intimations going before of that time, that all manifestations of God even now are awful, and often as it were kept back with a gracious and merciful forbearance to mankind. It will, I think, be observed in Scripture throughout, that greater

manifestations of God, and declarations accompanied with the least reserve, are ever the most awful and severe. For instance, when St. John the Baptist first of all proclaimed the kingdom, it was with fearful words,—of “the axe at the root of the tree,” and the “fire unquenchable.” And when our LORD went up at last to Jerusalem, He spoke more openly and publicly, before the Jews and in the temple; but then the things that belonged unto their peace were hidden from their eyes, and they could not believe; and His teaching was far more severe than it had been; therefore the more open manifestation was an awful matter, a matter for serious apprehension.

Again, after His death the Jews were given one trial more; the HOLY GHOST was sent down, and the preaching of the Gospel was more open and public than ever before, and this preceded their condemnation; as if in some degree, and in some sense, guilty of sin against the HOLY GHOST, of the terrible effects of which they had been so strongly warned; then their final destruction came. This more public manifestation therefore was, I say, matter for serious apprehension.

A far more extensive manifestation is now taking place over the whole world. Now the event to be apprehended in the last days, as closing the period of the world's trial, when God will spare it no longer, is sin against the HOLY SPIRIT. And one does not see how this can take place, how the SPIRIT can be rejected, excepting when the SPIRIT is manifested. Therefore the knowledge of religion, which is now extending over the world, is a matter for serious apprehension. Not of course that this consideration affords any reason for withholding that knowledge: for to preach the Gospel to the world, is our office and duty, whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear; we are bound to do it, μαρτυρεῖν καὶ κηρύσσειν; but to learn how we may best do it is the part of Christian wisdom. But our having this knowledge should lead us to take the more heed, that we do not fall into that sin for which there are provided no further means of recovery.

And let it be remembered that the whole of this treatise is, under another name, on the subject of irreverence; but as rever-

ential words, or a reverential demeanour, may be but a specious irreverence and hypocrisy, this sacred reserve seems a better designation. Every step in this irreverence, every indication of it, is so far a state of progress towards the sin against the Holy Spirit. And as this latter is unpardonable, so we may perceive that a state of irreverence, where it has thoroughly affected the character, is irremediable. For if men have lost all reverence for God, how can they pray to Him? and if they cannot, nor have any sense of reverence for His power, who can help them? Under any other circumstances men may be guilty of the worst sins, and when greater light is manifested to them, even at the last hour, they may repent and be forgiven: but when that light has been habitually rejected, the case becomes very different, the Spirit is quenched, the light within is darkened. When the power of acknowledging God's presence, which is the eye of the soul, is lost, what else can restore it? None can approach Him without His help, and His help cannot be attained without a reverential acknowledgment of His presence.

It would appear, therefore, that under the dispensation of grace in which we live, in the light of these full revelations of God, as the highest privileges are to be derived from a due acknowledgment of God, so there is the greatest conceivable danger from an absence of that fear and reverence. A danger incalculably increased, and infinitely beyond that of former generations, if our knowledge be so much greater. And this irreverence is more especially to be guarded against in all our approaches to God, and our imperfect modes of serving Him. We must remember that one of the Ten commandments refers to it, which is expressed in more awful terms than any other,—viz., that we *take not that awful Name in vain*, the meaning of which is not to be limited to open profaneness, but must be as extensive in its intentions as all the other commandments. It is to be observed, again, that the first petition in the Lord's prayer seems to be for this reverence of mind, as the first thing to be obtained in all acts of devotion,—a prayer that God's *Name* may be *hallowed*: the efficacy of our prayers depending on the reverential regard we have for that dreadful Name: And the last clause in the same prayer is an act

or expression of reverence. And one of our SAVIOUR's first rules with regard to prayer, is, that we do not use "vain repetitions," i. e. use idle words without a sense of Whom we are speaking to. Indeed, the first words of that prayer,—“Our FATHER which art in Heaven,”—may teach us the same, for that God is in Heaven and we on earth, is given as a reason why our words should be few. And in religious worship our SAVIOUR's charges are chiefly directed against, what is called in Scripture, “hypocrisy.” Of course, we cannot confine this most subtle and pervading habit to those circumstances in which it was developed in the religion of that day; but of all other vices it is that which most changes its complexion with the aspects of the age, being in itself equally applicable to human nature in all times; and surely there is none which more thoroughly destroys in the heart all love of truth. Such formalism may of course be found in a strict observance of the external duties of religious worship; in a shape no less dangerous and subtle will it be developed in adopting modes of expression; and what is perhaps of all the worst, in taking hold of the most touching and sacred doctrines of Religion, entering as it were into the Holiest of Holies. In all things it consists in a want of reverence and fear, in having the *form of godliness* while the *power* of it is lost, the peculiar danger we are warned of in the last days.

10. *Want of reverence now prevailing.*

Let it be again considered, what this principle suggests respecting this knowledge which is now abroad, and how greatly our position is altered on account of that knowledge. For if the ALMIGHTY (according to His providential dealings with mankind) does withhold religious truth in a remarkable manner, the reason is because such truth is dangerous to us. It is dangerous to us to know it. Therefore, because we have these truths revealed to us, we are in a peculiar danger,—danger of neglecting them. There is no reserve in holding back that which is fully known; but there is *reverence* necessary because it is known. And therefore, the very fact of the Atonement, and other great doctrines

being known, is an occasion for reverence respecting them of the very highest degree.

It will be seen by a little consideration, how the circumstance of a Divine Revelation, greater spiritual light, i. e. a knowledge of God's presence, immediately alters the character of all actions, in the same manner as an action in Church, or near the Altar, is perfectly different from a similar action out of Church. So much is this the case as to render things, which on common ground would be indifferent, to be profane and sacrilegious in holy places. And this seems to explain how it is that Capernaum was worse than Sodom, Pharisees worse than heathens. In that walking in the nearer light of God's presence, if we may so speak, from the knowledge vouchsafed them, the complexion of their actions was thus altered. And, indeed, were we to look to the accounts of other writers, and human narrators, we should, perhaps, neither suppose those Jews, nor those places to be so far worse than others, as our Lord has pronounced them to be. It is in like manner that a habit of irreverence in a Church, is more injurious to the character than thoughtlessness without.

We have said, therefore, that God's present dealings with mankind are a subject for awful apprehension; surely, all manifestations which God is pleased to make of Himself ought to be so to sinful creatures, as they ever were to good men in Scripture. And far more so when it is considered with what little awe and apprehension these manifestations of God are being now received: how little reverential fear accompanies this knowledge; the disunion that prevails, and spirit of disobedience. When we add to this, that it was Israel that rejected CHRIST, that it was Jerusalem that put Him to death; that it was the place of His continual abode, which he declared worse than the cities of destruction; the dwelling place of His parents that thrust Him out. That it was more than once declared, as if proverbially and prophetically, and with a mysterious significancy, that CHRIST was to bear witness, that *in his own country a prophet is not received*. When we consider these things, then, I say, that the knowledge of God is an occasion for fear; and the more so because not now considered so. "Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be

increased," but yet, notwithstanding, "the unholy shall be unholy still, and the unclean unclean;" "the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of them shall understand."

The fearful extent to which this want of reverence in religion has gone, is, it is to be feared, very little considered or calculated upon. The degree to which all sense of the holiness of Churches is lost, is too evident; the efficacy of the Sacraments, the presence of God in them, and in His appointed ministerial ordinances is, it will be allowed, by no means duly acknowledged, and, indeed, less and less: men's eyes being not opened, they do not see with the patriarch, "how dreadful is this place," "the Lord was in this place, and I knew it not." There is also another point in which all due fear of God's awful presence is lost, very far beyond what many are aware of, and that is in regard for the Holy Scripture. Some indeed, who profess to uphold and value them, in order to do so, depreciate the Apocryphal books, and all others of less plenary inspiration; as if by so doing they were exalting the Scriptures. But in fact, they do but lower their own standard of what is holy; and then lower the Scriptures also to meet it. The effect also of setting aside the Catholic Church as the interpreter of Holy Scripture, as if it needed none, is of the same kind; it incalculably lowers the reverence for Scripture, by making it subject to the individual judgment. From these things it follows, that although the Holy Scriptures are pronounced Divine (for no evil is done, but under a good name) they are treated as if they were not; as if human thought could grasp their systems, could limit their meanings, and say to that boundless ocean in which the Almighty walks, "Hitherto shalt Thou come and no further." If Holy Scripture contains within it the living Word, has a letter that killeth, and a Spirit that giveth life, with far different a temper ought we to regard it: by prayer, as the Fathers say, we should knock at the door, waiting till He that is within open to us; it should be approached as that which has a sort of Sacramental efficacy about it, and therefore a savour of life, and also unto death; in short, as our SAVIOUR was of old, by them who would acknowledge Him as God, and receive His highest gifts. As the Centurion who sent the elders of the

Jews unto Him, not venturing himself to approach ; thus, humble faith from the dark corner of these latter days would rather seek to interpret through the Antient Church than herself to presume. Far otherwise are the Sacred Scriptures now treated in evidences, in sermons, in controversial writings, in religious discourse. Divine words are brought down to the rule, and measure, and level of each man's earthly comprehension. And hence arise our Theological disputings, founded on words of Scripture, first brought down to some low, limited sense, and then thought to clash with and exclude each other. The Antients, on the contrary, considered the Holy Scriptures like the heavens which were marked out by the lituus of the heathen soothsayer, wherein every thing that was found was considered full of Divine import : and speaking from God to man. They took Scriptural words as Divine words, replete with pregnant and extensive meaning. Thus when believing in CHRIST, or confessing CHRIST, is spoken of as Salvation, St. Augustine remarks that such words are not to be taken after a low and human interpretation, but imply believing and confessing after a real and substantial manner according to the import of Divine words : and that to believe and confess this, according to truth and the vastness of Scripture, is indeed entering into the greatness of the Christian inheritance, which is signified by believing in CHRIST as God, with that corresponding awe and obedience which such a belief requires. With like reverential regard St. Chrysostom, when commencing his commentary on St. Matthew, likens it to approaching the gates of the heavenly city, and adds, " Let us not then with noise, or tumult enter in, but with a mystical silence. In this city must all be quiet and stand with soul and ear erect. For the letters not of an earthly king, but of the Lord of angels are on the point of being read." How many thousands of modern books had been unwritten ; how much jealous controversy spared, had this sense of Holy Scripture been among us !

It is, of course, from the want of a saving knowledge of God that there exists such a want of religious fear : for fear cannot but increase with an increasing knowledge of His presence, and, therefore, with all holiness of life. The subtle and predominant

spirit, which is the source of the irreverence of the age, consists in a forgetfulness of God, even in religion, and, therefore, in looking to impression rather than truth. It finds a place in Ministers, in reading the prayers, in preaching, in conversation. It is seen in a higher regard paid to the pulpit than to the altar. In setting preaching above the Sacraments, for that arises from looking to man rather than to God. This is, in fact, that which we would condemn in the spirit of the age respecting building of Churches, distribution of the Scriptures, and the like. Not things of course in themselves to be reprehended, but in the mode and tone which characterizes religious actions in the present day. There is a want of fear. The same may be said, when right conduct is pursued, having for its end rather to set a good example to men, than to obtain favour of God, which is a species of what Holy Scripture calls hypocrisy. The numerous schemes of education which are abroad partake of the same earthly character, and the futility of them is of itself a proof of something wrong. They are founded on the idea of education consisting in knowledge, whereas it consists rather in affording right pleasures and pains. They are vain attempts after something different from that path which God has marked out, which is obedience to Parental, and Pastoral, and Episcopal authority, whereas these commence in breaking one of these ties. Hence the disunion which prevails; each has a prejudice, each a system, each an opinion, while the centre of union, the key-stone is lost. It was very well for heathen philosophers to be forming schemes of education and systems of politics; and if human wisdom could have effected any thing they had far better chance of success than we. We have it revealed from Heaven, that there is no way of wisdom, but that of obedience and the Cross. What else can be right education, but that which consists in entering more fully into the privileges of that kingdom of Heaven which is among us? of what little value is any knowledge, excepting so far as it brings us into this invisible world? This is the consideration which makes us unwilling to expose the sacred things of God. Not as if we enviously withheld a boon that has been in any degree freely given to ourselves; but that with a due sense

of its value, God has ever connected a reverential modesty in imparting knowledge: for the very nature of Christian knowledge necessarily implies a desire to communicate, while it regulates itself by the laws of true wisdom. Such a desire will ever show itself, in a forbearance towards the errors of others, allowance for their unavoidable ignorance, and aptitude to teach, arising from watchful endeavours to do them real good.

We may well suppose that the knowledge of CHRIST can scarcely be better described than by those many descriptions of the pursuit after wisdom, and the way in which she discloses herself to them that seek her. It is the fear of God throughout which is the only access to her; "the fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom:" "the fulness of wisdom is the fear of the LORD:" "the crown of wisdom is the fear of the LORD:" "come unto her as one that ploweth and soweth:" "he that is without understanding will not remain with her. She will be upon him as a mighty stone of trial; and he will cast her from him, ere it be long. For Wisdom is according to her name, and is not manifest unto many. . . . Put thy feet into her fetters. . . bow down thy shoulder, and bear her, and be not grieved with her bonds. Come unto her with all thy whole heart, and keep her ways with all thy power. Search, and seek, and she shall be made known unto thee; and when thou hast got hold of her, let her not go. For at the last, thou shall find her rest." All these expressions, and such as these, may range themselves as comments and lessons around that one great truth,—a subject worthy of our most thoughtful contemplation, *viz.*, that CHRIST Crucified was exposed to the view of all mankind, CHRIST Risen only seen by a few witnesses chosen of God.

11. *Summary of the whole subject.*

All that has been observed of our LORD's conduct may suggest to us much respecting our own condition, as now living in this His dispensation of grace. / That the meaning of the kingdom of heaven upon earth, and the Evangelical revelations may be said to consist in this; that God is (as when revealed in the

flesh) infinitely near to us, and that if we discern Him not, it is our own fault. It is as if heaven itself were not a local change, but that the invisible FATHER, and SON, and HOLY GHOST, and the Majesty of heaven were around us, and with us, and that we might have this truth disclosed to us, after some ineffable manner, if we will bow our heads to that lowly portal. This reserve by which God discloses Himself, in all natural and revealed religion, proves the entrance to be narrow and confined. That it is not by speculative inquiry, nor learned research, but by deepest humiliation of soul and body, that we must feel after Him, and expect pain and trouble in doing so, knowing that He is "a consuming fire," and therefore will burn up what is human about us, as we approach Him. Infinitely happy if we may do so at any cost. That sensible good of all kinds dims and obscures the due perception of Him; that every step towards it is contrary to our natural tendencies, for to know God is entirely a matter of faith; which is to the spiritual life what breath is to the natural life, the beginning of it, and co-extensive with it; of which it may be said, "when Thou takest away their breath they die, and are turned again into their dust."

That our position is, after some mysterious and transcendent manner, analogous to that of those who saw our LORD in the flesh; that this knowledge, which is the reward of obedience, has the effect of bringing men into some intimate connexion with Himself, would appear from the descriptions which are given of it. For unto him that will keep His commandments, and act up to His sayings, JESUS CHRIST will be as mother, and sister, and brother. Which, and many other like expressions, imply being brought into some mysterious consciousness of His Presence. Obedience itself is quickened and enlivened by CHRIST'S Presence, without which, it could not be, and therefore is often called faith or love, as being that in man by which he apprehends Him, in opposition to the human understanding. Revelation has supplied us through the whole of our moral probation with living means, a living way, and a living end. The end is Personal, and the means also a living Person. The yearnings of our nature after knowledge, the yearnings after love, here find their object:

the friendship and the wisdom, which the heathen philosopher considered as the end and perfection of the practical virtues, and most needful for the soul's rest, are here combined,—combined in one living object of affection, Personal, Human, Divine.

Such reflections should encourage in us habits of reverence, reserve, and fear, as considering the awful dispensation under which we walk. We may observe how much there is in this principle to withdraw us from the world, and from the busy excitement that prevails. Every messenger that comes from the world in these evil times, may well cause the Christian to feel as did the prophet, "when he settled his face stedfastly" on the messenger, and then turned aside "and wept."

As God has declared Himself not to be in noise and tempest, but in the still small voice, so has He shown Himself in all His manifestations to mankind. In the older dispensation He was ever as One who, in disclosing, hideth Himself. When our Lord appeared on earth in His incarnation, He was still ever as one who, ever desirous to manifest, yet in love for mankind withdrew Himself. The same was ever the case in His Church in its purest and best days; it was ever (as in faint imitation of her Lord) a system of reserve, in which the blessings of the Kingdom were laid up, as a treasure hid in a field. (And such is still the system of the Church throughout all her ways; God dwelleth in secret, and by faith only can be discerned. Faith is the key to His secret treasures. All that is directed to the eye of God will in some measure partake of this reserve. In opposition to which, all the ways of the world, of human expediency, all systems and practices that look to man, will be marked by an absence of this reserve. As far as we look to God we shall have this; as far as we look to man we shall have it not; and as far as thoughts of man are allowed to enter into the sanctuary and worship of God, our conduct will be marked by an absence of this reserve. The world knows not God, and cannot know Him; so far, therefore, as we know Him, so far also, the world also will not know us, and will not understand our ways, and our words. So that from the very nature of the case, this reserve becomes necessary and unavoidable. If we make those secrets

of God known to it, we shall injure ourselves, by bringing the gaze of the world into the secrets of God, and His holy place; and injure others also, for those things which they cannot understand, they will not reverence. If we wish to do good to the world we must not look to it, but unto God; our strength must be in secret where God is; the bad instruments of the world (such as the daily periodical) must not be ours; the platform is not our strength, nay, even the pulpit itself is not our chief strength, in these we must yield to others if they wish it: but our chief strength must be the Altar; it must be in Sacraments and prayers, and a good life to give efficacy to them; and in secret alms to the poor to buy their prayers, which have great power with God. Our strength must be in secret where God is. If others have recourse to thoughtless controversial disputations, we must leave such to them, and endeavour, ourselves, to learn the truth, and our obedience shall be their light. Remembering always, that this reserve of Holy Scripture, in which every thing that is good must be now, more or less, concealed, is ever calculated to lead on our thoughts by a necessary connexion to that great manifestation, when there is "nothing secret that shall not be manifest;" neither any thing hid that shall not be known and come abroad, when He who now "seeth in secret, shall reward openly" those that wait for Him. /

NOTES.

If the subject of this Treatise is not distinctly brought forward by the older Divines of our Church, the reason obviously is because the evils it is intended to controvert have been more peculiarly developed in the present age. But the principle is often allowed incidentally; and the following instances may serve to express, in the words of others, what has been the writer's meaning. The first passage from Dr. Isaac Barrow had not been seen by the writer, till after the publication of Tract No. 80; but expresses very much the view he has taken respecting our LORD's conduct and that of the Apostles. Sermon LXIII. The Doctrine of Universal Redemption, vol. iii. p. 403. Oxford Edition, 1818.

"That God doth commonly observe this method (plainly suitable to divine justice, wisdom, and goodness) to dispense the revelation of His truth, according to men's disposition to receive it, and aptness to make a fruitful and worthy use

of it, *to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance*, as St. John Baptist spake; and to withhold it from those who are indisposed to admit it, or unfit to profit by it; we may from divers express passages and notable instances (beside many probable intimations) of Scripture learn. We may on the one hand observe, that those whom our

Saviour did choose to call, were persons disposed easily upon His call to comply; to forsake their fathers and their nets; to leave their receipts of custom; to relinquish all, (relations, occupations, estates,) and to follow Him; faithful Israelites, without guile, like Nathaniel, (that is, as is probably conjectured, St. Bartholomew;) men honestly devout, and charitable, like Zaccheus; that He chose to converse with publicans and sinners, men apt to be convinced of their errors, and touched

with the sense of their sins; apt to see their need of mercy and grace, and therefore ready to entertain the overtures of them; that He blesses God for revealing His mysteries to babes, (to innocent and well-meaning, imprejudicate and uncorrupted persons) such as if men were not, they could in nowise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, or become Christians; those *poor in spirit, of whom is the Kingdom of Heaven*; those *foolish things* which God chooses as most fit objects of His mercy and grace; that He enjoined His disciples, in their travels for the pro-

pagation of the Gospel, to inquire concerning the worthiness or fitness of persons, and accordingly to make more close applications to them: *Into what city or village ye enter, inquire who therein is worthy;* and entering in abide there. Of this proceeding we have a notable instance in Cornelius, who, for his honest piety (correspondent to the proportion of knowledge vouchsafed him), was so acceptable to God, that in regard thereto he obtained from Him the revelation of truth in a peculiar and extraordinary manner. And St. Paul was another most remarkable example thereof; who for the like reason was so wonderfully called, as himself intimates, describing himself to have been *ζηλωτής Θεοῦ, zealously affected toward God, according to the righteousness in the law, blameless;* one that had continually behaved himself with all good conscience toward God; who, even in the persecution of God's truth, did proceed with an honest meaning, and according to his conscience, for which cause he saith, that God had mercy on him; foreseeing how willingly he would embrace the truth, and how earnestly promote it. We may also observe how, in the Acts of the Apostles, the Holy Spirit commonly directed the Apostles to such places, where a competent number of people were well disposed to receive the truth; who were *εὐθεροὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, well disposed to the Kingdom of Heaven*, and consequently by God's foresight (*τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*) ordained to have the word of eternal life (the *τὸ σωτήριον Θεοῦ*, as it is in a parallel place called) discovered to them; such people as the Bereans, men ingenuous and tractable; who consequently entertained the word *μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας*, with all promptitude and alacrity. To such persons God sometimes by extraordinary revelation directed the Apostles to preach; as to the Corinthians, in respect to whom the Lord spake to St. Paul in a vision, saying, *Fear not, but speak, and be not silent; for I am with thee, because πολλοὶ ἔσσι μοι λαός, there is for me much people in this city;* much people whom I see disposed to comply with my truth. So in behalf of the Macedonians, *ἀνὴρ τις Μακεδόν, a certain man of Macedonia*, was in a vision seen to St. Paul, exhorting him and saying, *Passing into Macedonia, help us.* Thus, on that hand, doth God take special care that His Truth be manifested to such as are fitly qualified to embrace it, and use it well. Thus is God ready to make good that answer of Pothinus (Bishop of Lyons, and immediate successor to St. Irenæus) to the prefect, who asking him *Who was the Christians' God?* was answered, *Ἐάν τις δέξισι, γνώσῃ, If thou be worthy, thou shalt know;* thus, as the wise man divinely saith, the divine Wisdom, *δέξισις ἀνθρώπων περιπλῆγεται ζητοῦσα, goeth about, seeking such as are worthy of her; sheweth herself favourable unto them in their ways, and meeteth them in every thought.*

“And on the other hand, that God withholdeth the special discoveries of His

Matt. x. 11.

Acts xxii. 3.

— xxiii. 1.

πεπολίτευμαι.

Phil. iii. 6.

Acts xxvi. 9.

Gal. i. 14.

Acts xxvi.

1 Tim. i. 3.

Luke ix. 62.

Acts xiii. 48.

— xvii. 11.

— xxviii. 28.

Acts xviii. 9, 10.

Acts xvi. 9.

Euseb. v. 1.

Wisd. vi. 16.

Truth, upon account of men's indispositions and demerits, may likewise very plainly appear. We may suppose our Lord to have observed Himself, what He

ordered to His disciples : *not to give that which is holy to dogs, nor to cast their pearls before swine*, (not to expose the holy

and precious truth to very lewd and fierce people, who would snarl at it, and trample upon it :) we may allow God, in His dispensation of His truth and grace,

to do what He bids the Apostles to do : before he enters into any house, or applies himself to any person, to examine whether the house or person be worthy, that is, willing to receive

him, and apt to treat him well ; if not, to decline them. Our Lord, we see, did leave even His own country, seeing men

there were not disposed to use Him with due honour and regard ; seeing they were possessed with vain prejudices, apt to obstruct the efficacy of His divine instructions and miraculous performances so that He was not likely (according to the ordinary way of divine providence) to produce any considerable effect towards their conversion. *He could not*, it is said, *do many miracles there, because of their unbelief* : He could not, that is, according to the most just and wise rules He did observe, He would not do them, because He perceived the doing them would not

conduce to any good purpose ; that they were not apt to look upon those works as the effects of divine power and goodness, performed for their benefit (for inducing them to faith and repentance) ; but rather that the doing them would expose God's mercy to contempt or reproach, at least to neglect or disregard.

Hence our Saviour declined conversing with persons indisposed to (those *ψυχικοί*, who cannot *δέχσθαι τὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος*) receive benefit by His instruction and example, to grow wiser

or better by His conversation : as the Pharisees and Scribes ; men prepossessed with corrupt opinions and vicious affections, obstructive to the belief of His doctrine and observance of His laws ; and worldly persons ; proud and self-conceited,

crafty and deceitful, covetous, ambitious, and worldly men, incorrigibly tinctured with that *φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός*, *carnal wisdom and affection*, which is *enmity to God* : so that it is

not subject to the law of God, nor can be ; inextricably engaged in the friendship of the world, which is enmity to God : to such men the Gospel

would certainly be a scandal or a folly : they would never be able to relish or digest the doctrine of purity, self-denial, patience, and the like doctrines opposite to carnal sense and conceit which it

teacheth. From such wise and prudent men (conceited of their little wisdoms, and doting upon their own fancies) God

did conceal those heavenly mysteries, which they would have despised and derided : those *many wise according to the flesh*, *many powerful*, *many noble*, God did not choose to call into His Church. Accord-

ingly we may observe in the history of the Apostles, that God's Spirit did prohibit the Apostles passing through some places, it discerning how unsuccessful (at those seasons, in those circumstances, according to those dispositions of men),

their preaching would be: *Passing through Phrygia and Galatia, being hindered by the Spirit to speak the Word in Asia; coming to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit suffered them not.* Moreover there is plainly the like reason, why God should withhold His saving truth from some people, as why He should withdraw it from others, when it is abused or proves fruitless: but of such withdrawing we have many plain instances, attended with the declaration of the reasons of them. Our Lord prophesied thus concerning the Jews: *I say unto you, that the Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and shall be given to a nation doing the fruits thereof;* they, when our Saviour would have gathered them under His wings, wilfully refusing. Our Lord charged His disciples, when by any they were repulsed or neglected in their preaching, to leave those persons and places, *shaking off the dust from their feet*, in token of an utter (*εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς*) detestation and desertion of them: and accordingly we see them practising in their acts; when they perceived men perversely contradictory, or desperately senseless and stupid, so that they clamoured against the Gospel, and thrust it from them, they abstained from farther dealing with them, turning their endeavours elsewhere, toward persons of a more docile and ingenuous temper; thence more susceptible of faith and repentance. To you, say Paul and Barnabas to the contradicting and reproachful Jews, *it was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken; but seeing you put it from you, (or thrust it away from you, ἀπωθίετε αὐτόν) and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, we turn to the Gentiles.* So when the Church of Ephesus was grown cold in charity, and deficient in good works, God threatens to remove her candlestick; or to withdraw from her that light of truth, which shone with so little beneficial influence. It seems evident that God, for the like reasons, may withhold the discovery of His truth, or forbear to interpose His providence, so as to transmit light thither, where men's deeds are so evil, that they will love darkness rather than light; where their eyes are so dim and weak, that the light will but offend, and by the having it hurt them; where they, by the having it declared to them, will only incur further mischief and misery; it would prove to them but *ὀσμὴ θανάτου, a deadly scent*, as the most comfortable perfumes are offensive sometimes, and noxious to distempered bodies. Wherefore, as where the light doth shine most clearly, it is men's voluntary pravity, that by it many are not effectually brought to salvation; so it is men's voluntary depraving and corrupting themselves, (misusing their natural light, choking the seeds of natural ingenuity, thwarting God's secret whispers and motions, complying with the suggestions of the wicked one,) so as to be rendered unmeet for the susception of God's heavenly truth and grace, which hinders God (who proceedeth ordinarily with men in sweet and reasonable methods, not

Acts xvi. 6.

Matt. xxi. 43.

Matt. x. 14.

Luke ix. 5.

Acts xiii. 51.

— xviii. 6.

Acts xiii. 46.

— xxviii. 26.

Rev. ii. 5.

καὶ γὰρ τὰς ὕς
(φασὶ) τὸ μύρον
πνίγει. Chrys.

John iii. 19.

2 Cor. ii. 16.

- in way of impetuous violence and coercion) from dispensing them. We may say of such, in the words of the Prophets, *They have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations. Your iniquities have turned away these things, and your sins have withholden good things from you.* Τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ἀγαθότητι πᾶσιν ὁ Κύριος ἐγγίζει· μακρύνομεν δὲ ἑαυτοῦς ἡμεῖς διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. *God doth by His goodness approach to all, but we set ourselves at distance by sin,* saith St. Basil; and *ὅπου αὐτοπροαίρετος πονηρία, καὶ καὶ ἀποχή τῆς χάριτος,* where there is self-chosen or affected wickedness, there is a withholding of grace,
- 2 Cor. iv. 3. says another Father (apud Cyrill. Hier.) The Gospel, if it be hidden, it is, as St. Paul says, hidden *ἐν τοῖς δωλλομένοις*, in viris perditis, *among lost men* (that is, men desperately gone in wickedness, incorrigible, unreclaimable people), in whom the God of this world (that is, as St. Chrysostom expounds it, not the devil, but the good God Himself) *hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, so that the light of the glorious Gospel hath not shined to them:* (πῶς οὖν ἐτέφλωσεν; how, then, did God blind them? saith St. Chrysostom), *ὅτε ἐναργήσας εἰς τοῦτο, ἔπαυε;* not by any efficacy of His upon them toward that; *ἔτι ἐπὶ τούτῳ;* but by permission and concession; for so the Scripture is wont to speak, *ἐπειδὴν γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἠπίστησαν πρῶτοι, καὶ ἀναξίους ἑαυτοῦς κατασκεύασαν τοῦ ἰδεῖν τὰ μυστήρια, καὶ αὐτὸς λοιπὸν ἔλασεν· ἀλλὰ τί ἔδει ποιῆσαι; πρὸς βίαν ἔλκειν, καὶ ἐκκαλύπτειν μὴ βουλομένοις ἰδεῖν; ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἂν καταφρόνησαν, καὶ οὐκ ἂν εἶδον.* Seeing, saith he, they disbelieved first, and constituted themselves unworthy to see the mysteries, even God at last let them alone; for what should He have done? Should He have drawn them violently, and discovered it to them, being unwilling to see? They would then have more despised it, and not have seen it. God is ever willing and ready to dispense His mercies and favours; but He is not wont to do it extraordinarily (or beside the course of His ordinary provision), but in a proper and fit season, in that *καιρὸς ἐπαρόσθεντος*, acceptable time and day of salvation, when He seeth men capable of receiving them; which season commonly dependeth upon man's will and choice, or the results of them. Καθόλου γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς οἶδεν τοὺς τε ἀξίους τῶν αγαθῶν καὶ μὴ ὄντας τὰ προσήκοντα ἑκάστοις διδόναι· Σωτήρ γὰρ ἴστωρ οὐχὶ τῶν μὲν, τῶν δ' οὐ· πρὸς δὲ ὅσον ἐπιτηδεύοντος ἑκάστος εἶχεν, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διένειμεν εὐεργεσίαν for (saith Clemens Alex. in his 7th of the Stromata, where he clearly and fully affirms our present doctrine) our Lord is not the Saviour of some and not of others; but according as men are fitly disposed, He hath distributed His beneficence to all. St. Augustine himself somewhere speaketh no less; or rather more: *Præcedit aliquid in peccatoribus,* saith Quæst. 68. Tom. he, quo, quamvis nondum sint iustificati, digni efficiantur iusticiæ.
- In lib. de div. Quæst. LXXXIII. less; or rather more: *Præcedit aliquid in peccatoribus,* saith Quæst. 68. Tom. he, quo, quamvis nondum sint iustificati, digni efficiantur iusticiæ.
- VI. Part 1.

Venit de occultissimis meritis,
&c. Ibid.

ficatione: et idem præcedit in aliis peccatoribus quo digni sint obtentione. But

"3. If all these considerations do not thoroughly satisfy us concerning the reason of God's proceedings in this case, we may consider that God's providence is inscrutable and impenetrable to us: that, according to the Psalmist, as *God's mercy is in the heavens, and His faithfulness reacheth to the clouds; so His righteousness is like the great mountains* (too high for our reason to climb), and *His judgments, πολλή ἀβυσσος*, a great abyss, too deep for our feeble understanding to fathom; that His ways are more subtle and spiritual, than to be traced by our dim and gross sight."

A train of thought very similar to that which has been expressed in this Treatise, will be found in the following observations of Pascal:—

"The purpose of God to conceal Himself from some, and to reveal Himself to others."

"It was the purpose of God to redeem mankind, and to extend salvation to those who will seek it. But men render themselves so unworthy of it, that He is equitable in refusing to some, because of the hardness of their hearts, that which He bestows on others, by a mercy to which they have no claim. Had He chosen to overcome the obstinacy of the most hardened, He could have done so by revealing Himself to them so distinctly, that they could no longer doubt the truth of His existence. And He will so appear at the last day, with such an awful storm, and such a destruction of the frame of nature, that the most blind must see Him.

"He did not, however, choose thus to appear at the advent of grace, because as so many men rendered themselves unworthy of His clemency, He determined that they should remain strangers to the blessing which they did not desire. It would not then have been just to appear in a mode manifestly divine, and such as absolutely to convince all men; nor would it have been just, on the other hand, to come in a mode so hidden, that He could not have been recognized by those who sought Him in sincerity. It was His will to make Himself perfectly cognizable to all such; and hence, willing to be revealed to those who seek Him with their whole heart, and hidden from those who as cordially fly from Him, He has so regulated the means of knowing Him, as to give indications of Himself, which are plain to those who seek Him, and shrouded to those who seek Him not.

"2. There is light enough for those whose main wish is to see; and darkness enough to confound those of an opposite disposition. There is brightness enough to enlighten the elect; and sufficient obscurity to keep them humble. There is mystery enough to blind the reprobate; but light enough to condemn them, and to make them inexcusable.

"If this world subsisted only to teach men the existence of God, His divinity

would have shined forth in every part of it, with resistless splendour. But since the world only exists by Jesus Christ, and for Him, and to teach men their fall and their redemption, the whole abounds with proofs of these two truths. The appearance of things indicates neither the total abandonment, nor the plenary presence of the Divinity, but the presence of *a God that hideth Himself*. Every thing wears this character.

" If God had never appeared at all, such a total concealment might have been ambiguous, and might have been referred equally to the non-existence of Deity, as to the unworthiness of men to know Him. But His occasional manifestations remove the ambiguity. If He has appeared once, then He is always; and we are shut up to the conclusion, that there is a God, and that men are unworthy of His manifested presence.

" 3. The purpose of God was more to rectify the will than the understanding of man. Now, an unclouded brightness would have satisfied the understanding, and left the will unreformed. Had there been no obscurity, man would not have been sensible of his corruption. Had there been no light, man would have despaired of a remedy. It is then, not only equitable, but profitable for us, that God should be partly hidden, and partly revealed; since it is equally dangerous for man to know God, without the consciousness of his misery; or to know his misery, without knowing his God.

" 4. All things around man teach him his real state; but he should read them rightly; for it is not true, either that God is wholly revealed, or wholly hidden. But both these assertions are true together, that He hides Himself from those who tempt Him, and that He discovers Himself to those who seek Him. Because men are, at the same time, unworthy of God, and yet capable of receiving Him; unworthy, in consequence of their corruption; capable, by their original nature.

" 5. Every thing on earth proclaims the misery of man, or the mercy of God; the powerlessness of man without God, or his might when God is with him. The whole universe teaches man, either that he is corrupt, or that he is redeemed. All things teach him his greatness or his misery. In the heathen he sees the withdrawal of God: in the Jews, His presence and protection.

" 6. All things work together for good to the elect, even the obscurities of Scripture; for they reverence them on account of those portions which are manifestly divine. All things are evil to the reprobate, even the plainest truths of Scripture, because they blaspheme them on account of those obscurities, which they cannot comprehend.

" 7. If Jesus Christ had only come to sanctify and save, the whole of Scripture, and all other things, would have tended to that object; and it would have been easy indeed to convince the infidel. But since, as Isaiah says, chap. viii. 14. He became both as *a sanctuary* (for salvation) and *a rock of offence*, we cannot expect to overcome the obstinacy of infidelity. But this does not militate against us, since we ourselves affirm that God's dealings with us were not meant to carry conviction to those stubborn, self-satisfied spirits, who do not sincerely seek for truth.

"Jesus is come, *that those who see not, may see; and that those who see may become blind.* He came to heal the diseased, and to let *the whole perish*; to call *sinners to repentance* and justification, and to leave *the righteous*, those who think themselves righteous, in their sins: *to fill the hungry with good things, and to send the rich empty away.*

"What say the prophets of Jesus Christ? That He should be manifestly God? No; but that He is the true God veiled; that He shall be unrecognized; that men shall not think that this is He; that He shall be a *stone of stumbling*, on which *many shall fall.*

"It is that Messiah might be known by the good, and unknown by the wicked, that He is foretold as He is. If the mode of His coming had been fully unfolded, there would have been no obscurity even to the wicked. If the period had been foretold obscurely, there would have been darkness on the minds of the good; for their moral state would not convey to them the idea of Hebrew notation; for instance, that a *ו* should signify 600 years. The time, therefore, was foretold plainly; the mode mystically.

"Thus the wicked, erroneously supposing that the blessings promised were temporal, were misled, although the time was so distinctly foretold; while the righteous avoided the error, because the comprehension of such blessings is with the heart, which always calls that good, that it really loves. But the knowledge of the time was not a matter for the comprehension of the heart; and thus the clear pointing out of the time, together with an obscure description of the blessing, could only mislead the wicked.

"8. Why was it necessary, with respect to Messiah, that it should be stated of Him, that in Him the sceptre was to remain perpetually in Judah; and yet at His coming, the sceptre should be taken from Judah? As a provision, *That seeing, they might not see; and that hearing, they might not understand*, nothing could be more effectual. Instead of lamenting that God is hidden, we should thank Him that He has been so far revealed; we should thank Him that He has not revealed Himself to the prudent and proud of this world, who were unworthy to know a holy God.

"9. The genealogy of Jesus Christ, in the Old Testament, is blended with so many others apparently useless, as to be scarcely discernible. If Moses had only registered the ancestry of Jesus Christ, the fact would have been too plainly exhibited. But even to an accurate observer, it may be distinctly traced through Tamar, Ruth, Bathsheba, &c. Even the apparently weak points in the chain of evidence, have a peculiar force to a well-constituted mind. Witness the two genealogies by Matthew and Luke, which prove that there has not been collusion.

"10. Let them not reproach us any longer with the want of clearness in our evidence. We own the fact as part of our system. But let them recognize the truth of our religion, even in its obscurities, in the little light that we have, and in the indifference respecting the discovery of it, which is so generally manifested. Had there been but one religion, God would have been too manifest. The case were the same, if our religion only had its martyrs.

"Jesus Christ so far left the wicked to their wilful blindness, in that He did not say he was not of Nazareth, nor that He was not the son of Joseph. As Jesus Christ dwelt unrecognized among men, so the truth dwells undistinguished among the crowd of vulgar opinions.

"If the mercy of God is so great, that it makes us wise unto salvation, even while He hideth Himself, what illumination may we not expect when He is fully revealed?

"We can know nothing of the work of God, if we do not admit as a first principle, that He blinds some, while He enlightens others."

The advice which has been suggested in this Treatise is the same as that which was given by Mr. Mede, as we find mentioned in the following extract from a memoir prefixed to his works; being an "Appendix to the Author's Life," by one who was intimately acquainted with Mr. Mede.

"Of his Advice to young Students in Divinity."

"To those who intended *Curam Animarum*, he would give, among many other, these Three Counsels. 1. That they familiarly acquaint themselves with, and constantly make use of that *Golden Observation* of *Is. Casaubon*, viz. *Universam Doctrinam Christianam Veteres distinguebant in rã lexapa, id est, ea qua enunciari apud omnes poterant, &c., rã ἀπόρρητα, arcana temere non vulganda*. It is in his *Exercit. XVI. ad Annot. Eccles.*; which whole *Exercitation* he would commend to their often reading, and indeed the whole book.

"And here he would sadly complain, to the same effect, and almost in the same words with the admired Lord *Verulam*: 'It is a point of great inconvenience and peril, to entitle the people to hear controversies and all kinds of doctrine. They say no part of the counsel of God is to be suppressed, nor the people defrauded; so as the difference which the Apostle maketh between *milk* and *strong meat* is confounded; and his precept, That *the weak be not admitted unto questions and controversies*, taketh no place.'

"Upon neglect of which sage counsel, we have lately seen those dismal and tragical consequences, which Mr. *Mede* did indeed prophetically presage would be thereupon: and for the present he gave some instances (but not without indignation) of them who, under pretence of revealing the whole truth to the people, would make choice of strange texts, in *Leviticus* and elsewhere, and out of them vent such stuff as no modest ear could endure to hear."

On the subject of religious conversation nothing is intended, but what may be found expressed in spirit and intention at least, in the writings of Bishop Wilson. His wishes on that subject, and the rules which he set himself, may be found in the following passage from his private prayers.—V. *Sacra Privata* especially. *Thursday Medit.*

" Religious Discourse in ordinary Conversation."

" Give me a lively sense of the value of religion, and make it the delight of my heart ; that I may speak of it with great judgment, seriousness, and affection, and at all seasonable times."

" May that good Spirit, which appeared in the likeness of tongues of fire, warm my heart, direct my thoughts, and guide my tongue, and give a power to persuade ; that by my conversation and example, as well as by my sermons and writings, I may promote the kingdom and interests of my great Master. Amen."

" Set a guard, O Lord, upon my mouth, and keep the door of my lips."

" The mouth of the righteous seeketh wisdom, and his tongue talketh of judgment."

" It is strange that that which is every body's greatest concern, should be nobody's discourse."

" The want of religious discourse in common conversation is one of the chief causes of the decay of Christian piety."

" Hearts truly touched with the love of God, will communicate their light and heat to others in their ordinary conversation ; will speak honourably of God, of His perfections, His justice, goodness, wisdom, and power,—the excellency of His laws,—the pleasantness of His service,—the instances of His love,—the rewards He has promised to His friends, and the punishments He has prepared for His enemies."

" And by doing so we shall recommend God and religion to those we converse with ; win over subjects to Him, &c., and add to our own happiness."

" Col. iv. 6. Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man."

" One mild, prudent, and edifying conversation, has often gained more souls than many sermons."

He gives the following

" Rules."

" Never talk of religion, but when you think seriously of it. Not to betray the want of it by one's discourse of it, which should be *decent, grave, sober, prudent*. That our discourse of religion be practical rather than notional, or disputing ; that it be devout, edifying after an hearty and affectionate manner."

" That it may be seasonable ; that is, when men are like to be the better for it.—Not in promiscuous company ; not mixed with sports, hurry, business, nor with drink. Nor to cast pearls before swine."

" That we join a good life to our religious discourses ; and never to contradict our tongue by our deeds."

" Luke xxiv. 30. As He sat at meat, He took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them, and their eyes were opened."

" We may know religious persons, not only in the exercise of religious actions,

but even in the most common actions of life, which they convert into holy actions, by the manner of doing them, the holiness of their disposition, by prayer, &c."

"We always do good or harm to others by the manner of our conversation; we either confirm them in sin, or awaken them to piety."

"It is an extraordinary talent to be able to improve conversation to the advantage of religion, by taking some fit occasion to say something that is edifying and beneficial."

"The great subject of a Christian's discourse should be, about the true way of attaining the grace of God, through the blood of Christ, and by the assistance of the Holy Spirit. But then they must say no more than what they are sure of, lest they should lead men into error; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless, that taketh His name in vain, and speaketh not the truth as it is in Jesus."

"Let us take all opportunities of communicating our belief of Christ to others, both to bear witness and confess Him before men, and to increase our own faith and reward."

On the subject of administering the consolations of religion, Bishop Wilson has the following remarks in his "*Maxims of Piety*."

"Comforts and Fears."

"*Religion* brings the greatest comforts along with it; but then it should be remembered, that such comforts belong to true Christians only. We should be very careful not to administer them to such as have no right to them. They that want to be awakened are by far more than they that want comfort. To teach people to make the best use of their affliction; to teach people how to die well; to exhort sinners to a sincere repentance; to let men know plainly when they are, and when they are not in a state of salvation. This is the true, and only safe way of administering comfort.

"*Spiritual comforts* are great blessings; but, unless attended with obedience, self-denial, humility, and other works of faith and labours of love, &c. may be delusions of Satan."

In the same practical *Maxims* he speaks of religious knowledge, of itself, as a cause for apprehension.

"Knowledge."

"The knowledge of which we make no use will only serve to condemn us. Such knowledge is to be dreaded."

"When one considers how very, very often the Jews perverted, mistook the words of Christ, one cannot but set down this for a certain truth,—that none but good, sincere men are capable of understanding the Gospel."

"*Knowledge*, without practice, will only serve to increase our condemnation."

"How much is knowledge to be dreaded, when our works are not answerable!"

"*Knowledge*, when not accompanied with humility, serves generally no other end, but to increase our sins."

The gradual mode in which the Almighty is pleased to inculcate knowledge, of which the fathers speak so much, is expressed in the following passage from the "*Divine Considerations of Valdeaso*," as translated by Mr. Nicholas Ferrar, although apparently with no sort of reference to the fathers.

"I understand that as if the sun should break forth altogether with all his splendour, it would in such sort blind the eyes of the traveller, that he would not be able to make any more use of them than if it were night: even so, in like manner, if the Spirit of God should at once give unto a person all that knowledge which He gives in length of time, it would blind him, and put him in greater inconvenience than at first. And because this is true, I understand that our God, rich in liberality and in mercy, gives unto us His Spirit; and He gives it unto us in such manner, as it may help and not harm us; not according to our appetites, but according to His eternal wisdom, by which, as a good Father, He governeth them who are His sons, remaining incorporated in His only Son, Jesus Christ our Lord."—*Consideration XLVI. p. 156.*

It is very pleasant on any subject of a devotional nature, to be able to refer to the words of Mr. James Bonnel; and it will be seen, by the following remarks which he makes in a letter to a friend, that he had a strong feeling on this subject of religious discourse, and the necessity of this sacred modesty. In a letter, dated St. Peter's Day, 1693, (page 168 of the Edit. 1829.) he says:—

"There is particularly one thing that I have started in discourse, which I intended, when I got leisure, to speak of more at large in writing; and that was, about outward expressions of piety. I confess, as to myself, I have been always reserved in them; such, I ween, as were easily imitable by persons of any sort; as lifting up the hands and eyes, godly words, and expressions of endearment concerning God. Since I have conversed with you, I have spoken more of these things than ever I did before; but I have complied with it only towards you. Now the case, I think, is this; it is our duty, on fit occasions, to declare ourselves publicly for God, and for the cause of His holy religion, when it may be for His glory, and the edification of others; and the engaging and rivetting ourselves in His service, by setting the eyes of the world upon us, and making them witnesses against us, if we swerve or falter from our professions. But then, this ought to be done by some solid, essential expressions of true piety, which none, indeed, but those that are truly pious can attain to; such as a gracious countenance, an humble mien, an unaffected modesty, and a cheerful and sincere frankness in declaring that we are the servants of God, and devoted to Him; or speaking words drawn from the soul of piety, which amount to such a declaration as those of the Apostle: 'If any man love not the Lord Jesus, let him be accursed.' But

then, these words must not be borrowed from others, or even from Scripture itself, but originally our own; for any one may speak good sentences by rote. There are some expressions that tend not so much to show a devotedness to God, or resolutions or desires to serve Him, as our nearness to Him. These are carefully to be avoided; for they tend too much to heighten a good opinion of ourselves; are apt to move envy or censure; and may happen in some measure to deprive us of that nearness, by casting a little damp upon our consciences, and causing God to withdraw His favours; such are accounts of transports and elevations that God gives us in His service; and very endearing expressions in mentioning of God; as, my dearest Lord, my sweet Jesus, my loving Father, instead of saying only God; which I have heard some persons use upon too ordinary occasions, when one could not well suppose that they had a present lively sense and feeling at their heart, of what they spoke, answerable to the height of the words; for none can have a sense in their hearts, adequate to such words as these, but it will put them into a transport, which will either express itself in a flood of tears, or in silence, and hinder them from readily going on with other talk. There are other expressions, which are the language of our hearts immediately to God Himself; and it is ill to use ourselves to speak or write these, but when our hearts indeed go along with them, and have intercourse with God. But it is hard to suppose, when we use them too frequently, our hearts can always go along with them: and this gives matter of offence to good people, and is a prejudice to ourselves; for if we use to speak such words as ought to be spoke only to God Himself, without speaking them, indeed, to Him with our hearts, it will certainly indispose our hearts to speak to Him in those words when we would: because we shall get a way of speaking such things by rote, and not be able to discern when, indeed, we speak to God, and when we do not."

The intention of this Tract may perhaps best be shown by some examples of persons who have thought it requisite naturally to observe such reserve in their own conduct, or have noticed it in others. The following striking instances are from Mrs. Schimmelpenninck's "Tour to Alet" and "Memoirs of Port Royal"

M. Lancelot remarks of M. Pavillon, Bishop of Alet:—

"The Bishop possesses the art of directing discourse usefully, without constraint. He never forces the subject, but always gives, even to the most remote, a tincture of his own piety. His conversation appears to me a true model of social intercourse, directed by Christian piety, and spiritual wisdom."

"He equally avoids the error of those worldlings who always shun religion, and of those unwise religionists, who, by making it the sole subject of discourse are often led into formality and hypocrisy. Here is no religious chit-chat. He never utters a sacred truth, without appearing deeply penetrated with the awful reality."—Vol. I. p. 58. Second Edit. 1816.

"When with those whose religious sentiments permit him freely to unfold, then, indeed, his lips seemed touched with a living coal from the altar."

"I have often seen his hearers wrapt in astonishment and awe at the apostolic zeal and sanctity with which he declared divine truths, in the name of Him who sent him."

"His wisdom, information, and good sense, render his conversation instructive on all subjects. Yet it is evident this is the one on which his heart dilates, and that this is the point in which all his other studies centre. Though not always conversing on religion, it is at all times apparent, that it is the medium through which he views every other thing; and I think his deep piety is almost as perceptible in the spirituality with which he speaks of temporal things, as in the wisdom which he displays in spiritual ones. Every subject on which he discourses, I might almost say every sentence which he utters, receives a tincture from his piety. The Spirit dwelling in the heart, as on an altar, sanctifies in some sort, whatever gift has been upon it, and imparts to it a sacred character. His piety so modifies his learning, that the most religious might edify; and his learning so adorns his piety, that the most sceptical might be convinced."

"Contrary to the manner of some, he seldom speaks of religion to determined infidels. But, where it is possible, he rather joins in their subject of discourse, only speaking in a Christian spirit. 'The unbelief of the head,' he says, 'is mostly founded in the enmity of the heart;' he therefore thinks the persuasion of the affections ought to co-operate with the conviction of the judgment. On this account he thinks it most judicious, to let them feel the excellency of Christianity in its practical effects, before he recommends it as a general principle."

"When he speaks to those who ask his advice, he is very careful to address each one according to his own degree of light. He thinks the work is often ruined by indiscreetly urging persons beyond the step the Divine Spirit is then pointing out to the conscience."

"M. d'Alet has often in his mouth that text, 'Cast not your pearls before swine.' Though far indeed from comparing any individual of his fellow creatures to those animals, yet he often calls the experiences of Christ's love, 'His people's pearls,' and says, 'they should not be lightly cast before those who will not only trample them under foot, but who will endeavour, by turning upon Christians with futile sophisms, to rend their peace and comfort.' He rather advises, 'that the common experiences of men,' such as convictions of sin, repentance, &c., be dwelt on, till the fallow ground is fully broken up and prepared to receive the seed of the kingdom."

"What I have seen at Alet, has convinced me that it is much more common and easy to speak well on religion, than to speak of temporal things at all times in a religious spirit."—*Ibid.* p. 55, &c.

"He attends with the greatest love and patience, all those who open to him their spiritual wants. He, however, wishes to accustom them rather to seek aid of God, than of men. In this respect, he follows the examples of M. de St. Cyran, of St. Austin, and of St. John. He thinks the practice of constantly

unbosoming ourselves to men, creates religious gossiping, and extinguishes vital piety; and accustoms young believers to consider men as more necessary to them than God."—*Ibid.* p. 73.

The following are remarks of M. Lancelot, upon the Abbé de St. Cyran: "We often wished that M. de St. Cyran could have had a person continually with him to note down all his actions, and to pourtray all his holy discourses, his eminent virtues, and even the eloquence of his silence, which has so often spoken to our hearts. God, however, no doubt for wise purposes, has not permitted it. Perhaps, indeed, it might not be a thing so easily done. The most eminent graces, like the deepest rivers, generally pursue a silent course. They possess, in degree, the peace, and immutability of their Divine Author. It is immediately felt in its effects, though it cannot be described in its source. It is that powerful and constant effusion of the Spirit of God which transforms the heart of the new man, and continually abides therein. Which does not dazzle by brilliant and remarkable actions, so much as it imparts a living unction and a Godlike dignity to the most common ones. It produces throughout the whole soul, mind, and heart, a certain simplicity, profound peace, gentle love, and immutable calmness, that charms and elevates the heart of the observer, though he scarcely knows why. He is filled with awful reverence in contemplating the whole, whilst he is yet unable to discover any thing extraordinary in each part. As to its effects, the perfection of saints on earth is, perhaps, more perceptible in what they do not, than in what they actually do."

"So far as it may be said of man in his fallen state, it consists in a perfect silence of all human passions, and a total extinction of every movement of earthly pleasures and desires. The silence of the man of God differs from the tumult of the world, as the still expanse of the ocean differs, and yet exceeds, in sublimity, a roaring summer torrent which lays waste all in its way, and disappears for ever. It consists in that spotless holiness which is best comprehended when we contrast with it our own disorder and impurity. It is a participation on earth of the happiness of the blessed in heaven. It is the beginning of that ineffable union with God, which, though begun on earth, can only be consummated in Heaven. Happy, indeed, are those to whom it has pleased the Lord to exhibit such models of virtue. Yea, rather more blessed are those, that hearing, keep their sayings!"—*Ibid.* p. 236, &c.

The deep feelings of awe expressed in the following passage, will doubtless be seen to have no very indirect bearing on the subject.

"An observation frequently made by M. Arnauld, might peculiarly be applied to the M. Angélique. He used often to say, 'that the death-bed of young converts is generally most bright: because their newly acquired sense of the mercy of God, in some sort dazzles their eyes from steadily beholding His holiness;' and he mostly added, 'the experienced Christian has too solid a view of the mercy of God, in Christ, not to rejoice; but he has too exalted views of the holiness of God, not to rejoice with trembling.'

"In the beginning of her illness, the awful part of the prospect seemed

chiefly present with the venerable mother. Death was always before her. She spoke of nothing else, and thought of nothing else; so that she might almost have said with the Apostle, 'I die daily.' She was so penetrated with a sense of the infinite holiness of God, and of her own unworthiness, that she could not think without awe of the moment when her soul should appear in His presence."

"Believe me, my dear children," said she to her nuns, "no one knows how unspeakably awful is death! nor can any person, yet afar off, form the least conception of what it is to stand on the brink of eternity. As for myself, I have had a serious sense of death before my eyes from my early years, and for, above the last fifty years, I may say, it has continually been in my thoughts. But now that I stand at the very threshold, I find all my most serious thoughts and meditations as less than nothing, compared with the unspeakable awfulness of the reality of what I feel it to be at this hour. The anticipation of such a change as it now seems to me, would alone detach from every human pleasure and make every pain sit light. As the soul stands between time and eternity, ready to ascend to God, the earth itself sinks and dwindles into a mere speck, though she can more clearly discern the path she has passed through! How is it possible for a Christian to have any other pain or pleasure, or object of occupation during all his life, than preparing himself for this awful hour."—*Ibid.* Vol. II. p. 255, &c

The following extract from a private journal, may serve to shew that a person who takes diligent and strict care of himself, may be naturally led to observe some rule of reserve in discoursing on subjects of religion, as a matter of practical wisdom and prudence. And it may be noticed that the person who makes these observations, was not only very remarkable for this reserve, as being a person of deep thought and strong affection, as has been noticed in the preface to the second part of his 'Remains,' but that he more than once calls himself to account, as will appear from this and other parts of his Journal, for speaking of what he calls *στυγηρα*. "Thus," he says, "by a sort of fatality talked *στυγηρα*, which had the usual effect of unsettling my feelings." In the next page, "I talked with S. about Milton, I think bordering on *στυγηρα*."—Froude's Remains, Vol. I. p. 37.

But the following passage speaks of the subject rather with reference to practical good sense in conversation than to offending against religious delicacy.

"An uncomfortable absurdity keeps hold of me, that my own opinions become false, when I allow contrary ones to be sported in my presence with impunity. Also it suggests itself to me that a wise thought is wasted when it is kept to myself: against which, as it is my most bothering temptation, I will set down some arguments to be called to mind in the time of trouble. In this day's lesson (Prov. xii. 23.) there is, 'a prudent man concealeth knowledge.'

Not allowing oneself to talk of an opinion, is one of the surest helps to acting upon it, as it *will* find some vent. Communicating it, is like opening the valve of a steam boiler. Besides, if other people assent to it in theory, while they contradict it in their way of life, it gives us a fresh difficulty to encounter in annexing to it its real force: seeing people take up with blank words, 'Salt that hath lost its savour,' is excessively infectious. But, supposing they do not assist, this can only serve to confuse and stagger us, and leave us dissatisfied with them and ourselves; I do not mean our attainments, for of them we cannot think too little, but of our views, of which we ought never to permit ourselves to doubt. The sensible plan would be never to maintain an opinion contrary to the practice of others, unless we think we have sufficient weight with men to make them alter their likes and dislikes. But I am tired of making resolutions to be broken."—*Ibid.* p. 32.

A living writer has felt so strongly on the importance of this sacred modesty, that he has made it the subject of an entire poem: although, perhaps few have been aware how much he meant by it, or the full force of the sentiments of that hymn. It is too well known to render it allowable to quote the whole of it: but a consideration of it will add great weight to this Treatise; we allude to the "Fourth Sunday in Lent," in the Christian Year.

The advice which the author has wished to offer to young men on the subject of Church principles, he has heard expressed in a sermon, from which he has obtained leave to transcribe an extract, which will serve to explain his meaning better than he could himself.

"To embrace in their fulness the holy doctrines which the church has preserved to us, is not matter of names and words; not even of argument or proof. It is not even the holding certain truths, much less the clothing them in awful words. In this way people come to hold shreds and patches of truth, against our blessed Lord's warning, and so putting a piece of new cloth, unwrought, unadapted to themselves, to an old garment; that which is put in to fill it up, taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse. Thus, they injure themselves in their own faith, and may cause the truth itself to be evil spoken of. Use not high words, which express not what thou feeldest, but what thou wouldest wish to feel. Try not to work thyself up to feel what thou feeldest not; engage not upon high subjects and thoughts which are out of proportion to thy moral attainments; speak not of them in places ill-suited to them, or to persons unfitted to receive them; or when thyself art not in a fit frame, or more than what thou hast realized, (and this is what was meant by reserve as to religious knowledge) refrain thyself, and bind thyself to steady pursuit of present duty, remembering that thou art not thy own master, but that of all thou art, hast, doest, thou art to give account before God."

As much has been said in the course of this Tract concerning the doctrine of Christ crucified, as connected with that of Christians bearing the cross, one is

much afraid of seeming to speak controversially on a subject of so awful a nature ; it would therefore perhaps be as well, before closing it, to express one's meaning in the following prayers of Bishop Wilson :

" Luke ix. 23. *Jesus said to them all, if any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.*"

" O Jesus, who hast made this the rule and means of our salvation, enable us by Thy *Spirit*, Thy *doctrine*, and *example*, to observe it daily ;—to wean our hearts from a love and fondness for this world, its pleasures, profits, and all its idols ;—to mortify our corrupt affections, and to correct and amend what is amiss in us ;—that we may be meek, and humble, and temperate, and learn to submit our wills to the will and law of God. And grant, O Lord, that we may never lead heathens and unbelievers to have unworthy thoughts of Thee and of Thy religion, by our ungodly lives, while we pretend to be Thy followers."

" Luke xiii. 24. *Strive to enter in at the strait gate ; for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able.*"

" May we never flatter ourselves, that the way to Heaven and happiness is easy, and that the generality of Christian people are in the way of salvation, when Thou hast declared the contrary. O may Thy Spirit convince us, that our salvation is not to be secured without great watchfulness and care, without labour, pains, and diligence ;—and that, on these conditions, Thy goodness will enable us to overcome all the difficulties we can possibly meet with ! "

These Tracts are continued in Numbers, and sold at the price of 2d. for each sheet, or 7s. for 50 copies.

LONDON: PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.
1840.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

The following Works, all in single volumes, or pamphlets, and recently published, will be found more or less to uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in these Tracts :—

- Bp. Taylor on Repentance, by Hale.—*Rivingtons*.
 Bp. Taylor's Golden Grove.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, with translation.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Pusey on Cathedrals and Clerical Education.—*Roake & Varty*.
 Hook's University Sermons.—*Talboys, Oxford*.
 Pusey on Baptism (*published separately*).—*Rivingtons*.
 Newman's Sermons, 4 vols.—*Rivingtons*.
 Newman on Romanism, &c.—*Rivingtons*.
 The Christian Year.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Lyra Apostolica.—*Rivingtons*.
 Perceval on the Roman Schism.—*Leslie*.
 Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions.—*Duncan*.
 Dodsworth's Lectures on the Church.—*Burns*.
 Cary on the Apostolical Succession.—*Rivingtons*.
 Newman on Suffragan Bishops.—*Rivingtons*.
 Keble's Sermon on National Apostasy.—*Rivingtons*.
 Keble's Sermon on Tradition.—*Rivingtons*.
 Memoir of Ambrose Bonwick.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer.—*Rivingtons*.
 Law's first and second Letters to Hoadley.—*Rivingtons*.
 Bp. Andrews' Devotions. Latin and Greek.—*Pickering*.
 Hook's Family Prayers.—*Rivingtons*.
 Herbert's Poems and Country Pastor.—*Rivingtons*.
 Evans's Scripture Biography.—*Rivingtons*.
 Le Bas' Life of Archbishop Laud.—*Rivingtons*.
 Jones (of Nayland) on the Church.—*Rivingtons*.
 Bp. Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration.—*Rivingtons*.
 Bp. Beveridge's Sermons on the Ministry and Ordinances.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Bp. Jolly on the Eucharist.—*Rivingtons*.
 Fulford's Sermons on the Ministry, &c.—*Rivingtons*.
 Rose's Sermons on the Ministry.—*Rivingtons*.
 A Catechism on the Church.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Russell's Judgment of the Anglican Church.—*Baily*.
 Poole's Sermons on the Creed.—*Grant, Edinburgh*.
 Sutton on the Eucharist.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Leslie on the Regale and Pontificate.—*Leslie*.
 Pusey's Sermon on November 5.—*Rivingtons*.
 Bishop Wilson's Sacra Privata.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 The Cathedral, a Poem.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Palmer's Ecclesiastical History.—*Burns*.

Larger Works which may be profitably studied.

- Bishop Bull's Sermons.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Bishop Bull's Works.—*University Press*.
 Waterland's Works.—*Do*.
 Wall on Infant Baptism.—*Do*.
 Pearson on the Creed.—*Do*.
 Leslie's Works.—*Do*.
 Bingham's Works.—*Straker, London*.
 Palmer on the Liturgy.—*University Press*.
 Palmer on the Church.—*Rivingtons*.
 Hooker, ed. Keble.—*Rivingtons*.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

THE GREEK DEVOTIONS OF BISHOP ANDREWS,
TRANSLATED AND ARRANGED.

I HAVE SET WATCHMEN UPON THY WALLS, O JERUSALEM;
WHICH SHALL NEVER HOLD THEIR PEACE DAY NOR NIGHT.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE only deviation in the following Translation from the order of the original text, as we have it, has been in the case of such portions of it as are obviously without or out of place. These have been inserted into the main course of the Prayers, or collected together, or, if repetitions, omitted. No alterations have been made in the text itself, and all transpositions are noted as they occur.

CONTENTS:

	Page
1. Preparation. Times of Prayer	3
Places of Prayer.	4
Circumstances of Prayer	5
2. Order of early or Matin Prayer— <i>Litany—Confession—</i> <i>Commendation</i>	6
3. Order of Evening Prayer— <i>Meditation—Confession—</i> <i>Commendation</i>	12
4. Course of Prayer for the Week (for each Day, under the five acts of <i>Confession, Prayer for Grace, Pro-</i> <i>fession, Intercession, and Praise, with an Introduc-</i> <i>tion</i>) :—	
First Day	17
Second Day	31

CONTENTS.

	Page
Third Day	38
Fourth Day	46
Fifth Day	56
Sixth Day	62
Seventh Day	70
5. Additional exercises :—	
A Deprecation	77
A Litany of Deprecation	78
Forms of Intercession—First	83
Second	84
Third	85
Fourth	86
Meditations on Christian Duty	87
On the Day of Judgment	88
On Human Frailness	90
A Preparation for Holy Communion	92

DAILY PRAYERS.

PREPARATION.

1. *Times of Prayer.*

Always. *Luke* xviii. 1.

Without ceasing. 1 *The*s. v. 17.

At all times. *Eph*. vi. 18.

Samuel among such as call upon His name¹. *Ps*. xcix. 6.

God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you and showing you the good and the right way.
1 *Sam*. xii. 23.

We will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word. *Acts* vi. 4.

He kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime. *Dan*. vi. 10.

In the evening, and morning, and at noon day will I pray, and that instantly, and He shall hear my voice. *Ps*. lv. 18.

Seven times a day do I praise Thee. *Ps*. cxix. 164.

1. In the morning, a great while before day. *Mark* i. 35.

2. In the morning watch. *Ps*. lxiii. 6. [vid. also *Ps*. cxxx. 6.]

3. The third hour of the day. *Acts* ii. 15.

4. About the sixth hour. *Acts* x. 9.

5. The hour of prayer, the ninth. *Acts* iii. 1.

6. The eventide. *Gen*. xxiv. 63.

¹ Transferred from p. 4. of Edition of 1676.

7. By night. *Ps.* cxxxiv. 2.

At midnight. *Ps.* cxix. 62.

2. Places of Prayer.

In all places where I record My Name, I will come to thee, and I will bless thee. *Ezod.* xx. 24.

Let¹ Thine eyes be open towards this house night and day, even toward the place of which Thou hast said, My Name shall be there; that Thou mayest hearken unto the prayer which Thy servant shall make towards this place. 1 *Kings* viii. 29.

Thou that hearest the prayer
unto Thee shall all flesh come.

The fierceness of man shall turn to Thy praise,
and the fierceness of them shalt Thou refrain.

As for me, I will come into Thy house
even upon the multitude of Thy mercy,
and in Thy fear will I worship
toward Thy Holy Temple.

Hear the voice of my humble petitions,
when I cry unto Thee;
when I hold up my hands
towards the mercy seat of Thy Holy Temple.

We wait for Thy loving kindness, O God,
in the midst of Thy Temple.

1. Among the faithful and in the congregation. *Ps.* cxi. 1.
2. Enter into thy closet and, when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret. *Matt.* vi. 6.
3. They went up into an upper room. *Acts* i. 13.
4. He went up upon the housetop to pray. *Acts* x. 9.
5. They went up together into the Temple. *Acts* iii. 1.
6. We kneeled down on the shore, and prayed. *Acts* xxi. 5.
7. He went forth over the brook Cedron, where was a garden. *John* xviii. 1.

¹ Transferred from pp. 5, 6, and 9, of Edition 1675.

8. Let them rejoice in their beds. *Ps.* cxlix. 5.
 9. He departed into a desert place and there prayed. *Mark*
i. 35.
 10. In every place lifting up holy hands without wrath
 and doubting. 1 *Tim.* ii. 8.

3. Circumstances of Prayer.

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Kneeling, | <i>humiliation.</i> | |
| He kneeled down and prayed. <i>Luke</i> xxii. 41. | | |
| He went a little further, and fell on His face, and prayed. | | |
| <i>Matt.</i> xxvi. 39. | | |
| My soul is brought low, even unto the dust, | | |
| my belly cleaveth unto the ground. | | |
| 2. Sinking the head, | <i>shame.</i> | |
| Drooping the face. [<i>Ezr.</i> ix. 6.] | | |
| 3. Smiting the breast, [<i>Luke</i> xviii. 13.] | <i>indignation.</i> | } 2 <i>Cor.</i> vii. 11. |
| 4. Shuddering, [<i>Acts</i> xvi. 29.] | <i>fear.</i> | |
| 5. Groaning, [<i>Isai.</i> lix. 11.] | <i>sorrow.</i> | |
| Clasping of hands. | | |
| 6. Raising of eyes and hands, [<i>Ps.</i> xxv. 15. cxliiii. 6.] | <i>vehement desire.</i> | |
| 7. Blows, [<i>Ps.</i> lxxiii. 14.] | <i>revenge.</i> | |

ORDER OF MATIN PRAYER.

Litany. Glory be to Thee, O LORD, glory to Thee.
Glory to Thee who givest me sleep
to recruit my weakness,
and to remit the toils
of this fretful flesh.

To this day and all days,
a perfect, holy, peaceful, healthy, sinless course,
Vouchsafe O LORD.

The Angel of peace, a faithful guide,
guardian of souls and bodies,
to encamp around me,
and ever to prompt what is salutary,
Vouchsafe O LORD.

Pardon and remission
of all sins and of all offences
Vouchsafe O LORD.

To our souls what is good and convenient,
and peace to the world
Vouchsafe O LORD.

Repentance and strictness
for the residue of our life,
and health and peace, to the end,
Vouchsafe O LORD.

Whatever is true, whatever is honest,
whatever just, whatever pure,
whatever lovely, whatever of good report,

Order of Matin Prayer.

if there be any virtue, if any praise,
such thoughts, such deeds,
Vouchsafe O LORD.

A Christian close,
without sin, without shame,
and, should it please Thee, without pain,
and a good answer
at the dreadful and fearful judgment-seat
of JESUS CHRIST our LORD,
Vouchsafe O LORD.

Confession. Essence beyond essence, Nature increate,
Framer of the world,
I set Thee, LORD, before my face,
and I lift up my soul unto Thee.
I worship Thee on my knees,
and humble myself under Thy mighty hand.
I stretch forth my hands unto Thee,
my soul gaspeth unto Thee as a thirsty land.
I smite on my breast
and say with the Publican,
God be merciful to me a sinner,
the chief of sinners;
to the sinner above the Publican,
be merciful as to the Publican.
Father of mercies,
I beseech Thy fatherly affection.
Despise me not
an unclean worm, a dead dog, or putrid corpse,
despise not Thou the work of Thine own hands,
despise not Thine own image
though branded by sin.
LORD, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean,
LORD, only say the word, and I shall be cleansed.
And Thou, my SAVIOUR CHRIST,
CHRIST my SAVIOUR,

Order of Matin Prayer.

SAVIOUR of sinners, of whom I am chief,
 despise me not, despise me not, O LORD,
 despise not the cost of Thy blood,
 who am called by Thy Name ;
 but look on me with those eyes
 with which thou didst look upon
 Magdalen at the feast,
 Peter in the hall,
 the thief on the wood ;—
 that with the thief I may call on Thee humbly,
 Remember me, LORD, in Thy kingdom ;
 that with Peter I may bitterly weep and say,
 O that mine eyes were a fountain of tears
 that I might weep day and night ;
 that with Magdalen I may hear Thee say,
 Thy sins be forgiven thee,
 and with her to love much,
 for many sins yea manifold
 have been forgiven me.
 And Thou, all-holy, good, and Life-giving Spirit,
 despise me not, Thy breath,
 despise not Thine own holy things ;
 but turn Thee again, O LORD, at the last,
 and be gracious unto thy servant.

Commendation.

Blessed art Thou, O LORD,
 our God,
 the God of our Fathers ;
 who turnest the shadow of death into the morning ;
 and lightenest the face of the earth ;
 who separatest darkness from the face of the light
 and banishest night and bringest back the day ;
 who lightenest mine eyes,
 that I sleep not in death ;
 who deliverest me from the terror by night,
 from the pestilence that walketh in darkness ;
 who drivest sleep from mine eyes,

and slumber from mine eyelids ;
who makest the outgoings of the morning and evening
to praise Thee ;
because I laid me down and slept and rose up again,
for the LORD sustained me ;
because I waked and beheld,
and my sleep was sweet unto me.
Blot out as a thick cloud my transgressions,
and as a cloud my sins ;
grant me to be a child of light, a child of the day,
to walk soberly, holily, honestly, as in the day,
vouchsafe to keep me this day without sin.
Thou who upholdest the falling and liftest the fallen,
let me not harden my heart in provocation,
or temptation or deceitfulness of any sin.
Moreover, deliver me to-day
from the snare of the hunter
and from the noisome pestilence ;
from the arrow that flieth by day,
from the sickness that destroyeth in the noon day.
Defend this day against my evil,
against the evil of this day defend Thou me.
Let not my days be spent in vanity
nor my years in sorrow.
One day telleth another,
and one night certieth another.
O let me hear Thy loving kindness betimes in the morning,
for in Thee is my trust ;
show Thou me the way that I should walk in,
for I lift up my soul unto Thee.
Deliver me, O LORD, for mine enemies,
for I flee unto Thee.
Teach me to do the thing that pleaseth Thee,
for Thou art my God ;
let Thy loving SPIRIT lead me forth
into the land of righteousness.
Quicken me, O LORD, for Thy Name's sake,

Order of Matin Prayer.

and for Thy righteousness' sake
bring my soul out of trouble ;
remove from me foolish imaginations,
inspire those which are good
and pleasing in Thy sight.
Turn away mine eyes
lest they behold vanity ;
let mine eyes look right on,
and let mine eyelids look straight before me.
Hedge up mine ears with thorns
lest they incline to undisciplined words.
Give me early the ear to hear,
and open mine ears to the instruction of Thy oracles.
Set a watch, O LORD, before my mouth,
and keep the door of my lips.
Let my word be seasoned with salt,
that it may minister grace to the hearers.
Let no deed be grief unto me
nor offence of heart.
Let me do some work
for which Thou wilt remember me, LORD, for good,
and spare me according to the greatness of Thy mercy.
Into Thine hands I commend
my spirit, soul, and body,
which Thou hast created, redeemed, regenerated,
O LORD, Thou GOD of truth ;
and together with me
all mine and all that belongs to me.
Thou hast vouchsafed them to me,
LORD, in Thy goodness.
Guard us from all evil,
guard our souls,
I beseech Thee, O LORD.
Guard us without stumbling,
and place us immaculate
in the presence of Thy glory
in that day.

Guard my going out and my coming in
henceforth and for ever.
Prosper, I pray Thee, Thy servant this day,
and grant him mercy
in the sight of those who meet him.
O God, make speed to save me,
O Lord, make haste to help me.
O turn Thee then unto me,
and have mercy upon me;
give Thy strength unto Thy servant,
and help the son of Thine handmaid.
Show some token upon me for good,
that they who hate me may see it and be ashamed,
because Thou, Lord, hast holpen me
and comforted me.

ORDER OF EVENING PRAYER¹.1. *Meditation.*

The day is gone,
and I give Thee thanks, O LORD.

Evening is at hand,
supply it with brightness.

As day has its evening
so also has life ;

the even of life is age,
age has fallen on me,

supply it with brightness.

Cast me not away in the time of age ;
forsake me not when my strength faileth me.

Even to my old age be Thou H^l,
and even to hoar hairs carry me ;

do Thou make, do Thou bear,
do Thou carry and deliver me.

Abide with me, LORD,
for it is toward evening,
and the day is far spent
of this fretful life.

Let Thy strength be made perfect
in my weakness.

Day is fled and gone,
life too is going,
this lifeless life.

Night cometh,
and cometh death,
the deathless death.

Near as is the end of day,
so too the end of life.
We then, also remembering it,
beseech of Thee
for the close of our life,
that Thou wouldest direct it in peace,
Christian, acceptable,
sinless, shameless,
and, if it please Thee, painless,
LORD, O LORD,
gathering us together
under the feet of Thine Elect,
when Thou wilt, and as thou wilt
only without shame and sins.
Remember we the days of darkness,
for they shall be many,
lest we be cast into outer darkness.
Remember we to outstrip the night
doing some good thing.
Near is judgment ;—
a good and acceptable answer
at the dreadful and fearful judgment-seat
of JESUS CHRIST
vouchsafe to us, O LORD.
By night I lift up my hands in the sanctuary,
and praise the LORD.
The LORD hath granted His loving kindness
in the day time ;
and in the night season did I sing of Him,
and made my prayer unto the God of my life.
As long as I live will I magnify Thee on this manner,
and lift up my hands in Thy Name.
Let my prayer be set forth in Thy sight
as the incense,
and let the lifting up of my hands
be an evening sacrifice.

Blessed art Thou, O LORD, our God,
 the God of our fathers,
 who hast created the changes of days and nights,
 who givest songs in the night,
 who hast delivered us from the evil of this day,
 who hast not cut off like a weaver my life,
 nor from day even to night made an end of me.

Confession.

LORD,
 as we add day to day,
 so sin to sin.
 The just falleth seven times a day;
 and I, an exceeding sinner,
 seventy times seven,
 a wonderful, a horrible thing, O LORD.
 But I turn with groans
 from my evil ways,
 and I return into my heart,
 and with all my heart I turn to Thee,
 O God of penitents and Saviour of sinners;
 and evening by evening I will return
 in the innermost marrow of my soul;
 and my soul out of the deep
 crieth unto Thee.
 I have sinned, O LORD, against Thee,
 heavily against Thee;
 alas, alas, woe is me! for my misery.
 I repent, O me! I repent, spare me, O LORD,
 I repent, O me, I repent,
 help Thou my impenitence.
 Be appeased, spare me, O LORD;
 be appeased, have mercy on me:
 I said, LORD, have mercy upon me,
 heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee.
 Have mercy upon me, O LORD, after Thy great goodness,
 according to the multitude of Thy mercies
 do away mine offences.

Remit the guilt,
heal the wound,
blot out the stains,
clear away the shame,
destroy the tyranny,
and make me not a public example.
O bring Thou me out of my trouble,
cleanse Thou me from secret faults,
keep back Thy servant also from presumptuous sins.

My wanderings of mind

and idle talking

lay not to my charge.

Remove the dark and muddy flood
of foul and wicked thoughts.

O LORD

I have destroyed myself;
whatever I have done amiss, pardon mercifully.

Deal not with us after our sins,

neither reward us after our iniquities.

Look mercifully upon our infirmities;

and for the glory of Thy All-holy Name,

turn from us all those ills and miseries,

which by our sins, and by us through them,
are most righteously and worthily deserved.

3. Commendation. To my weariness, O Lord,

vouchsafe Thou rest,

to my exhaustion

renew Thou strength.

Lighten mine eyes that I sleep not in death.

Deliver me from the terror by night,

the pestilence that walketh in darkness.

Supply me with healthy sleep,

and to pass through this night without fear.

O keeper of Israel,

who neither slumberest nor sleepest,

guard me this night from all evil,

guard my soul, O LORD.

Order of Evening Prayer.

Visit me with the visitation of Thine own,
reveal to me wisdom in the visions of the night.

If not, for I am not worthy, not worthy,
at least, O loving LORD,
let sleep be to me a breathing time
as from toil, so from sin.

Yea, O LORD,
nor let me in my dreams imagine
what may anger Thee,
what may defile me.

Let not my loins be filled with illusions,
but let my reins chasten me in the night season,
yet without grievous terror.

Preserve me from the black sleep of sin ;
all earthly and evil thoughts
put to sleep within me.

Grant to me light sleep,
rid of all imaginations
fleshly and satanical.

LORD, Thou knowest
how sleepless are mine unseen foes,
and how feeble my wretched flesh,
who madest me ;
shelter me with the wing of Thy pity ;
awaken me at the fitting time,
the time of prayer ;
and give me to seek Thee early,
for Thy glory, and for Thy service.

COURSE OF PRAYERS FOR THE WEEK.

THE FIRST DAY.

Introduction. Through the tender mercies of our God
the day-spring from on high hath visited us.
Glory be to Thee, O LORD, glory to Thee,
Creator of the light,
and Enlightener of the world,—
of the visible light,
the Sun's ray, a flame of fire,
day and night
evening and morning,—
of the light invisible
the revelation of God,
writings of the Law,
oracles of Prophets,
music of Psalms,
instruction of Proverbs,
experience of Histories,—
light which never sets.
God is the LORD who hath showed us light ;
bind the sacrifice with cords,
yea even unto the horns of the altar.

O by Thy resurrection raise us up
unto newness of life
supplying to us modes of repentance.
Thou God of peace
who didst bring again from the dead
the great Shepherd of the sheep,
through the blood of the everlasting covenant,
our LORD JESUS CHRIST,

perfect us in every good work,
 to do His will,
 working in us what is acceptable before Him,
 through JESUS CHRIST,
 to whom be glory for ever.

Thou who didst send down on Thy disciples
 on this day
 Thy Thrice-Holy SPIRIT,
 withdraw not Thou the gift, O LORD, from us,
 but renew it day by day
 in us, who ask Thee for it.

(1) *Confession.* Merciful and pitiful LORD,
 Long-suffering and full of pity,
 I have sinned, LORD, I have sinned against Thee;
 O me, wretched that I am,
 I have sinned, LORD, against Thee,
 much and grievously,
 in attending on vanities and lies.
 I conceal nothing :
 I make no excuses.
 I give Thee glory, O LORD, this day,
 I denounce against myself my sins;
 Truly I have sinned before the LORD,
 and thus and thus have I done.
 I have sinned and perverted
 that which was right,
 and it profited me not.
 And what shall I now say?
 or with what shall I open my mouth?
 What shall I answer, seeing I have done it?
 Without plea, without defence, self-condemned, am I.
 I have destroyed myself.
 Unto Thee, O LORD, belongeth righteousness,
 but unto me confusion of face,
 because Thou art just in all that is come upon me;

for Thou hast done right,
but I have done wickedly.
And now, LORD, what is my hope ?
Truly my hope is even in Thee,
if hope of salvation remains to me,
if Thy loving-kindness cover
the multitude of my iniquities.
O remember, what my substance is,
the work of Thine hands,
the likeness of Thy countenance,
the cost of Thy blood,
a name from Thy Name,
a sheep of Thy pasture,
a son of the covenant,
Despise not Thou the work of Thine own hands.
Hast Thou made for nought
Thine own image and likeness ?
for nought, if Thou destroy it.
And what profit is there in my blood ?
Mine enemies will rejoice ;
May they never rejoice, O LORD !
Grant not to them my destruction.
Look upon the face of Thine Anointed,
and in the Blood of Thy covenant,
the propitiation for the sins of the whole world,
LORD, be propitious unto me, a sinner ;
even unto me, O LORD, of sinners
chief, chiefest and guiltiest.
For Thy Name's sake be merciful unto my sin,
for it is great : it exceeds.
For Thy Name's sake, that Name,
beside which, none other under heaven
is given among men,
whereby we must be saved,
the SPIRIT Himself helping our infirmities,
and making intercession for us,
with plaints unutterable,

for the tender yearnings of the FATHER,
the bloody wounds of the SON,
the unutterable plaints of the SPIRIT,
Give ear, O LORD, have mercy, O LORD,
O LORD, hearken and do ;
defer not, for Thine own sake,
O my God.

For me, I forget not my sins,
they are ever before me ;
I remember them in the bitterness of my soul ;
I am anxious about them ;
I turn away and groan,
I have indignation and revenge
and wrath against myself.
I despise and bruise my own self,
that my penitence, LORD, O LORD,
is not deeper, is not fuller ;
help Thou mine impenitence.
And more, and still more,
pierce Thou, rend, crush my heart ;
and remit, forgive, pardon
what things are grief to me,
and offence of heart.

Cleanse Thou me from secret faults,
and keep Thy servant also from presumptuous sins.
Magnify Thy mercies towards the wretched sinner ;
and in season, LORD, say to me,
Be of good cheer ; thy sins are forgiven thee ;
My grace is sufficient for thee.
Say unto my soul, I am thy salvation.
Why art thou so heavy, O my soul ?
and why art thou so disquieted within thee ?
Return unto thy rest, O my soul,
for the LORD hath rewarded thee.
O LORD, rebuke me not in Thine indignation,
neither chasten me in Thy displeasure.
I said, I will confess my sins unto the LORD,

and so Thou forgavest the wickedness of my sin.

LORD, Thou knowest all my desire,
and my groaning is not hid from Thee.

Have mercy upon me, O God,
after Thy great goodness,
according to the multitude of Thy mercies
do away mine offences.

Thou shalt arise, and have mercy on me, O LORD,
for it is time that Thou have mercy upon me,
yea, the time is come.

If Thou, O LORD, shouldest mark iniquities,
O LORD, who shall stand ?

Enter not into judgment with Thy servant, O LORD,
for in Thy sight shall no man living be justified.

(2) *Prayer for
grace.*

My hands will I lift up
unto Thy commandments which I have loved.

Open Thou mine eyes that I may see,
incline my heart that I may desire,
order my steps that I may follow,
the way of Thy commandments.

O LORD GOD, be Thou to me a God,
Beside Thee let me have none else,
none else, nought else with Thee.

Vouchsafe to me, to worship Thee and serve Thee
in truth of spirit,

in reverence of body,

in blessing of lips,

in private and in public ;

to pay honour to them that have the rule over me,

by obedience and submission ;

to show affection to my own,

by carefulness and providence ;

to overcome evil with good ;

to possess my vessel in sanctification and honour ;

to have my converse without covetousness,

content with what I have ;

to speak the truth in love ;
to be desirous not to lust,
not to lust passionately,
not to go after lusts.

(*The Hedge of
the Law. i. e.
precautions.*)

1. To bruise the serpent's head. *Gen.* iii. 15.
2. To remember my latter end. *Deut.* xxvii. 29.
3. To cut off opportunities. *2 Cor.* xi. 12.
4. To be sober. *1 Pet.* v. 8.
5. Not to sit idle. *Matt.* xx. 6.
7. To shun the wicked. *Ps.* xxvi. 5.
8. To cleave to the good. *Rom.* xii. 9.
9. To make a covenant with the eyes. *Job* xxxi. 1.
10. To bring my body into subjection. *1 Cor.* ix. 27.
11. To give myself unto prayer. *1 Cor.* vii. 5.
12. To betake myself to penitence. *2 Pet.* iii. 9.

Hedge up my way with thorns,
that I find not the path
for following vanity.

Hold thou me in with bit and bridle,
lest I fall from Thee.

O LORD compel me to come in to Thee.

(3) *Profession.*

I believe, O LORD,
in Thee, Father, Word, Spirit, One God ;
that by Thy fatherly love and power
all things were created ;—
that by Thy goodness and love to man
all things have been begun anew
in Thy Word,—
Who for us men and for our salvation,
was made flesh,
was conceived and born,
suffered and was crucified,
died and was buried,
descended and rose again,
ascended and sat down,
will return and will repay ;—

that by the shining-forth and working
of Thy Holy Spirit,
hath been called out of the whole world
a peculiar people into a polity,
in belief of the truth
and sanctity of living :—
that in it we are partakers
of the communion of saints
and forgiveness of sins
in this world,—
that in it we are waiting
for resurrection of the flesh
and life everlasting
in the world to come.—
This most holy faith
which was once delivered to the saints
I believe, O LORD ;
help Thou mine unbelief,
and vouchsafe to me
to love the FATHER for His fatherly love,
to reverence the ALMIGHTY for His power,
as a faithful Creator, to commit my soul to Him
in well doing ;
vouchsafe to me to partake
from JESUS of salvation,
from CHRIST of anointing,
from the ONLY-BEGOTTEN of adoption ;
to worship the LORD
for His conception in faith,
for His birth in humility,
for His sufferings in patience and hatred of sin ;
for His cross to crucify beginnings,
for His death to mortify the flesh,
for His burial to bury evil thoughts in good works,
for His descent to meditate upon hell,
for His resurrection upon newness of life,
for His ascension, to mind things above,

for His sitting on high, to mind the good on His right,
 for His return, to fear His second appearance,
 for judgment, to judge myself ere I be judged.

From the SPIRIT

vouchsafe me the breath of salutary grace.

In the Holy Catholic Church
 to have my own calling, and holiness, and portion,
 and a fellowship ¹
 of her sacred rites, and prayers,
 fastings and groans,
 vigils, tears and sufferings,
 for assurance of remission of sins,
 for hope of resurrection and translation
 to eternal life.

(4) *Intercession.* O Hope of all the ends of the earth,
 and of them that remain in the broad sea ;
 O Thou on whom our fathers hoped,
 and Thou didst deliver them ;
 on whom they waited,
 and were not confounded ;
 O my Hope from my youth,
 from my mother's breasts ;
 on whom I have been cast from the womb,
 be Thou my hope
 now and evermore,
 and my portion in the land of the living :
 In Thy nature,
 in Thy names, in Thy types,
 in word and in deed,
 My Hope,
 let me not be disappointed of my hope.
 O the Hope of all the ends of the earth,
 remember Thy whole creation for good,

¹ This passage serves to illustrate St. Leo's language as it occurs in Tract 75. *Beatum Apostolum Petrum, cujus suffragantibus meritis, quæ poscimus, impetrare possimus per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum.*

visit the world in Thy compassion ;
 O guardian of men,
 O loving LORD,
 remember all our race.
Thou who hast shut up all in unbelief,
 on all have pity, O LORD.
O Thou who didst die and rise again,
to be LORD both of the dead and living.
 live we or die we,
 Thou art our LORD ;
LORD, have pity on living and dead.
 O helper of the helpless,
 seasonable aid in affliction,
 remember all who are in necessity,
 and need Thy succour.
 O GOD of grace and truth,
 establish all who stand in truth and grace,
 restore all who are sick with heresies and sins.
O wholesome Defence of Thine anointed,
 remember Thy Congregation
which Thou hast purchased and redeemed of old.
 O grant to all believers
 one heart and one soul.
Thou that walkest amid the golden candlesticks,
 remove not our candlestick
 out of its place.
 Amend what are wanting,
 establish what remain,
 which Thou art ready to cast away,
 which are ready to die.
 O LORD of the harvest
send forth labourers, made sufficient by Thee,
 into Thy harvest.
 O portion of those
 who wait in Thy temple,
 grant to our clergy,

rightly to divide the word of truth,
 rightly to walk in it;
 grant to Thy Christian people
 to obey and submit to them.

O King of nations, unto the ends of the earth;
 strengthen all the states
 of the inhabited world,
 as being Thy ordinance,
 through a creation of man.

Scatter the nations that delight in war,
 make wars to cease in all the earth.

O expectation of the isles and their hope,
 LORD, save this island,

and all the country in which we sojourn,
 from all affliction, peril, and need.

LORD of lords, Ruler of rulers,
 remember all rulers

to whom Thou hast given rule in the earth,
 and O remember specially
 our divinely-guarded king,

and work with him more and more,
 and prosper his way in all things.

Speak good things unto his heart,
 for Thy Church, and all Thy people,
 grant to him profound and perpetual peace,
 that in his tranquillity
 we may lead a quiet and peaceable life
 in all godliness and honesty.

O Thou by whom are ordained the powers that be,
 grant to those who are chief in court,
 to be chief in virtue and Thy fear;
 grant to the Parliament Thy holy wisdom;
 to our great men, to do nothing against
 but for the truth;
 to the courts of law, Thy judgments,
 to judge in all things concerning all
 without preference, without partiality.

O God of armies,
give a prosperous course and strength
to all the Christian army,
against the enemies of our most holy faith.

Grant to our population
to be subject unto the higher powers,
not only for wrath, but also for conscience-sake.
Grant to farmers and graziers good seasons;
to the fleet and fishers fair weather;
to tradesmen, not to overreach one another;
to mechanics, to pursue their business lawfully,
down to the meanest workman,
down to the poor.

O God, not of us only but of our seed,
bless our children among us,
to advance in wisdom as in stature,
and in favour with Thee and with men.
Thou who wouldst have us provide for our own,
and hatest the unnatural,
remember, LORD, my relations according to the flesh;
grant me to speak peace concerning them,
and to seek their good.

Thou who wildest us to make return
to our benefactors,
remember, LORD, for good,
all from whom I have received good;
keep them alive that they may be blessed upon earth,
and deliver them not
into the will of their enemies.

Thou who hast written
the man who neglects his own, as worse than an infidel,
remember in Thy good pleasure
all those in my household.

Peace be to my house,
the Son of peace upon all in it.
Thou who wouldst that our righteousness exceed
the righteousness of sinners,

grant me, LORD, to love those who love me,
my own friend, and my father's friend, and my friend's children,
never to forsake.

Thou who wouldest that we overcome
evil with good,
and pray for those who persecute us,
have pity on my enemies, LORD,
as on myself;
and lead them together with me to Thy heavenly kingdom.

Thou who grantest the prayers of thy servants
one for another,
remember, LORD, for good,
and pity all those
who remember me in their prayers,
or whom I have promised to remember in mine.
Thou who acceptest diligence in every good work,
remember, LORD, as if they prayed to Thee,
those who for any good reason
give not time to prayer.

Arise, and have mercy
on those who are in the last necessity,
for it is time that Thou hast mercy upon them,
yea the time is come.

Have mercy on them, O LORD,
as on me also, when in extremities.

Remember, LORD,
infants, children, the grown, the young, the middle aged, the old,
hungry, thirsty, naked, sick,
prisoners, foreigners, friendless, unburied,
all in extreme age and weakness,
possessed with devils, and tempted to suicide,
troubled by unclean spirits,
the hopeless, the sick in soul or body, the weak-hearted,
all in prison and chains, all under sentence of death.
Orphans, widows, foreigners, travellers, voyagers,
women with child, women who give suck,
all in bitter servitude, or mines, or galleys, or in loneliness.

Thou, LORD, shalt save both man and beast,
how excellent is Thy mercy, O GOD!
And the children of men shall put their trust
under the shadow of Thy wings.
The LORD bless us, and keep us,
and show the light of His countenance upon us,
And be merciful unto us.
The LORD lift up His countenance upon us,
And give us peace!

I commend to Thee, O LORD,
my soul, and my body,
my mind, and my thoughts,
my prayers, and my vows,
my senses, and my limbs,
my words, and my works¹,
my life, and my death;
my brothers, and my sisters,
and their children;
my friends, my benefactors, my well wishers,
those who have a claim on me;
my kindred, and my neighbours,
my country, and all Christendom.
I commend to Thee, LORD,
my impulses, and my startings,
my intentions, and my attempts,
my going out, and my coming in,
my sitting down, my rising up.

(5) *Praise.*

Up with our hearts;
we lift them to the LORD.
O how very meet, and right, and fitting, and due,
in all, and for all,
at all times, places, manners,
in every season, every spot,
everywhere, always, altogether,

¹ Page 172, edit. 1675.

to remember Thee, to worship Thee,
to confess to Thee, to praise Thee,
to bless Thee, to hymn Thee,
to give thanks to Thee,
Maker, nourisher, guardian, governor,
preserver, worker, perfecter of all,
 Lord and Father,
 King and God,
fountain of life and immortality,
treasure of everlasting goods.
 Whom the heavens hymn,
 and the heaven of heavens,
the Angels and all the heavenly powers,
 one to other crying continually,—
and we the while, weak and unworthy,
 under their feet,—
 HOLY, HOLY, HOLY
 Lord the God of Hosts ;
 full is the whole heaven,
 and the whole earth,
 of the majesty of Thy glory.
Blessed be the glory of the Lord
 out of His place,
for His Godhead, His mysteriousness,
His height, His sovereignty, His almightiness,
 His eternity, His providence.
The Lord is my strength, my stony rock, and my defence,
 my deliverer, my succour, my buckler,
the horn also of my salvation and my refuge.

THE SECOND DAY.

Introduction. My voice shalt Thou hear betimes, O LORD,
early in the morning will I direct my prayer unto Thee,
and will look up.

Blessed art Thou, O LORD,
who didst create the firmament of heaven,
the heavens and the heaven of heavens,
the heavenly powers,
Angels, Archangels,
Cherubim, Seraphim,
waters above the heavens,
mists and exhalations,
for showers, dew, hail, snow as wool,
hoar frost as ashes, ice as morsels,
clouds from the ends of the earth,
lightnings, thunders, winds out of His treasures, storms ;
waters beneath the heavens,
for drinking and for bathing.

Confession. I will confess my sins,
and the sins of my fathers,
for I have transgressed and neglected Thee, O LORD,
and walked perversely before Thee.
Set not, O LORD, set not my misdeeds before Thee,
nor my life in the light of Thy countenance.
But pardon the iniquity of Thy servant,
according to Thy great mercy ;
as Thou hast been merciful to him from a child,
even so now.
I have sinned, what shall I do unto Thee,
O Thou preserver of men ?

Why hast Thou set me as a mark against Thee,
so that I am a burden to myself?

O pardon my transgression,
and take away mine iniquity.

Deliver me from going down to the pit,
for Thou hast found a ransom.

Have mercy on me, SON OF DAVID,
LORD, help me.

Yea, LORD, even the dogs eat of the crumbs
which fall from their masters' table.

Have patience with me, LORD,
yet I have not wherewith to pay,

I confess to Thee;

forgive me the whole debt, I beseech Thee.

How long wilt Thou forget me, O LORD? For ever?

How long wilt Thou hide Thy face from me?

How long shall I seek counsel in my soul,
and be vexed in my heart day and night?

How long shall mine enemies triumph over me?

Consider and hear me, O LORD my God,
lighten mine eyes that I sleep not in death,
lest mine enemies say I have prevailed against him,
for if I be cast down, they that trouble me will rejoice at it;
but my trust is in Thy mercy.

(2.) *Prayer for
grace.*

Remove from me

(*The Ten Com-
mandments.*)

1. all iniquity and profaneness, superstition
and hypocrisy.
2. idols and idolatry.
3. rash oath and curse.
4. neglect or indecency of worship.
5. haughtiness and recklessness.
6. strife and wrath.
7. passion and corruption.
8. indolence and fraud.
9. lying and injuriousness.

10. every evil notion, every impure thought,
every base desire, every unseemly
thought.

Grant to me,

1. to be religious and pious.
2. to worship and serve.
3. to bless and swear truly.
4. to confess meetly in the congregation.
5. affection and obedience.
6. patience and good temper.
7. purity and soberness.
8. contentedness and goodness.
9. truth and incorruptness.
10. good thoughts, perseverance to the end.

(3) *Profession.*

I believe in God,

1. the FATHER, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.
2. And in JESUS CHRIST, His Only-begotten Son, our LORD.
 - (1.) conceived of the HOLY GHOST,
 - (2.) born of Mary, ever-virgin,
 - (3.) suffered under Pontius Pilate,
 - (4.) crucified,
 - (5.) dead,
 - (6.) buried.—
 - (1.) descended into hell,
 - (2.) risen from the death,
 - (3.) ascended into heaven,
 - (4.) set down on the right hand,
 - (5.) to return thence,
 - (6.) to judge both quick and dead,
3. And in the HOLY GHOST,
 - (1.) The Holy Church,
 - (2.) Catholic,
 - (3.) communion of saints,
 - (4.) remission of sins,
 - (5.) resurrection of flesh,
 - (6.) life everlasting.

And now, LORD, what is my hope?
 Truly my hope is even in Thee;
 in Thee, O LORD, have I trusted,
 let me never be confounded.

(4) *Intercession.*

Let us pray, God,
 for the whole creation;
 for the supply of seasons,
 healthy, fruitful, peaceable;
 for the whole race of mankind;
 for those who are not Christians;
 for the conversion of Atheists, the ungodly;
 Gentiles, Turks, and Jews;
 for all Christians;
 for restoration of all who languish in faults and sins;
 for confirmation of all
 who have been granted truth and grace;
 for succour and comfort of all
 who are dispirited, infirm, distressed, unsettled,
 men and women;
 for thankfulness and sobriety in all
 who are hearty, healthy, prosperous, quiet,
 men and women;
 For the Catholic Church,
 its establishment and increase;
 for the Eastern,
 its deliverance and union;
 for the Western,
 its adjustment and peace;
 for the British,
 the supply of what is wanting in it,
 the strengthening of what remains in it¹;
 for the episcopate, presbytery, christian people;
 for the states of the inhabited world;

¹ An allusion apparently to the Church in Sardis.—Rev. iii. 2.

for christian states,
far off, near at hand ;
for our own ;
for all in rule ;
for our divinely-guarded king,
the queen and the prince ;
for those who have place in the court ;
for parliament and judicature,
army and police,
commons and their leaders,
farmers, graziers, fishers, merchants,
traders, and mechanics,
down to mean workmen, and the poor ;
for the rising generation ;
for the good nurture of all the royal family,
of the young ones of the nobility ;
for all in universities, in law colleges,
in schools in town or country,
in apprenticeships ;
for those who have a claim on me from relationship,
for brothers and sisters,
that God's blessing may be on them,
and on their children ;
or from benefits conferred,
that Thy recompence may be on all
who have benefited me,
who have ministered to me in carnal things ;
or from trust placed in me,
for all whom I have educated,
all whom I have ordained :
for my college, my parish,
Southwell, St. Paul's, Westminster,
Dioceses of Chichester, Ely, and my present,
clergy, people, helps, governments,
the deanery in the chapel royal,
the almonry,

the colleges committed to me¹;
 or from natural kindness,
 for all who love me,
 though I know them not;
 or from Christian love;
 for those who hate me without cause,
 some too, even on account of truth and righteousness;
 or from neighbourhood,
 for all who dwell near me
 peaceably and harmlessly;
 or from promise,
 for all whom I have promised to remember
 in my prayers;
 or from mutual offices,
 for all who remember me in their prayers,
 and ask of me the same;
 or from stress of engagements,
 for all who on sufficient reasons fail to call upon Thee;
 for all who have no intercessor
 in their own behalf;
 for all who at present are in agony
 of extreme necessity or deep affliction;
 for all who are attempting any good work
 which will bring glory to the Name of God
 or some great good to the Church;
 for all who act nobly
 either towards things sacred or to the poor;
 for all who have ever been offended by me
 either in word or in deed.
 God have mercy on me and bless me;
 God show the light of His countenance upon me
 and pity me.
 God bless me, even our God,
 God bless me and receive my prayer;

¹ As Visitor.

O direct my life towards Thy commands,
hallow my soul,
purify my body,
correct my thoughts,
cleanse my desires,
soul and body, mind and spirit,
heart and reins.
Renew me thoroughly, O God,
for, if Thou wilt, Thou canst.

(5.) *Praise.*

The LORD, the LORD God,
merciful and pitiful,
longsuffering and full of pity, and true,
keeping pity for thousands,
taking away iniquities and unrighteousnesses and sins ;
not clearing the guilty one,
bringing sins of fathers upon children.
I will bless the LORD at all times,
His praise shall ever be in my mouth.
Glory to God in the highest,
and on earth peace,
goodwill to men.

The Angels,	guardianship ;
Archangels,	glory ;
Powers,	marvels ;
Thrones,	judgment ;
Dominions,	beneficence ;
Principalities,	government ;
Authorities,	against devils ;
Cherubim,	knowledge ;
Seraphim,	love.

THE THIRD DAY.

Introduction.

O God, Thou art my God,
early will I seek Thee.
Blessed art Thou, O Lord,
who gatheredst the water into the sea,
and broughtest to sight the earth,
and madest to sprout
herb and fruit tree.
There are the depths and the sea as on an heap,
lakes, rivers, springs ;
earth, continent, and isles,
mountains, hills, and valleys ;
glebe, meadows, glades,
green pasture, corn, and hay ;
herbs and flowers
for food, enjoyment, medicine ;
fruit trees bearing
wine, oil and spices,
and trees for wood ;
and things beneath the earth,
stones, metals, minerals, coal,
blood and fire, and vapour of smoke.

(1) *Confession.*

Who can understand his errors ?
Cleanse Thou me from secret faults.
Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins,
lest they have the dominion over me.
For Thy Name's sake
be merciful unto my sin,
for it is great.

My iniquities have taken such hold upon me
that I am not able to look up,
yea, they are more in number than the hairs of my head,
and my heart hath failed me.

Be pleased, O LORD, to deliver me,
make haste, O LORD, to help me.

Magnify Thy mercies upon me,
O Thou who savest them that trust in Thee.

I said, LORD, have mercy upon me,
heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee ;

I have sinned but I am confounded,
and I turn from my evil ways,
and I turn unto mine own heart,
and with my whole heart I turn unto Thee ;

and I seek Thy face,
and I beseech Thee, saying,
I have sinned, I have committed iniquity,
I have done unjustly.

I know, O LORD, the plague of my heart,
and lo, I turn to Thee with all my heart,
and with all my strength.

And Thou, O LORD, now from Thy dwelling place,
and from the glorious throne of Thy kingdom in heaven

O hear the prayer
and the supplication of Thy servant ;
and be propitious towards Thy servant
and heal his soul.

O God, be merciful to me a sinner,
be merciful to me the chief of sinners.
Father, I have sinned against heaven, and against Thee,
and am no more worthy to be called Thy son,

make me one of Thy hired servants ;
Make me one, or even the last,
or the least among all.

What profit is there in my blood,
when I go down to the pit ?
shall the dust give thanks unto Thee ?
or shall it declare Thy truth ?

Hear, O LORD, and have mercy upon me ;
 LORD, be Thou my helper ;
 Turn my heaviness into joy,
 my dreamings into earnestness,
 my falls into clearings of myself,
 my guilt, my offence into indignation,
 my sin into fear,
 my transgression into vehement desire,
 my unrighteousness into strictness,
 my pollution into revenge.

(2) *Prayer for grace.* Hosanna in the highest ¹.

Remember me, O LORD,
 with the favour that Thou bearest unto Thy people,
 O visit me with Thy salvation ;
 that I may see the felicity of Thy chosen,
 and rejoice in the gladness of Thy people,
 and give thanks with Thine inheritance.
 There is glory which shall be revealed ;
 for when the Judge cometh
 some will see Thy face cheerful,
 and shall be placed on the right,
 and shall hear those most welcome words,
 "Come, ye blessed."
 They shall be caught up in clouds
 to meet the LORD ;
 they shall enter into gladness,
 they shall enjoy the sight of Him,
 they shall be ever with Him.
 These alone, only these are blessed
 among the sons of men.
 O to me the meanest grant the meanest place
 there under their feet ;
 under the feet of Thine elect,
 the meanest among them.

¹ Vide p. 186, edit. 1673.

And that this may be,
let me find grace in Thy sight
to have grace,
so as to serve Thee acceptably
with reverence and godly fear. (*Heb. xii. 28.*)
Let me find that second grace,

not to receive in vain (*2 Cor. vi. 1.*)
the first grace,
not to come short of it; (*Heb. xii. 15.*)
yea, not to neglect it, (*1 Tim. iv. 14.*)
so as to fall from it, (*Gal. v. 4.*)
but to stir it up, (*2 Tim. i. 6.*)
so as to increase in it, (*2 Pet. iii. 18.*)
yea, to abide in it
till the end of my life.

And O, perfect for me what is lacking
of Thy gifts,

of faith, help Thou mine unbelief,
of hope, establish my trembling hope,
of love, kindle its smoking flax.

Shed abroad Thy love in my heart,
so that I may love Thee,

my friend in Thee, my enemy for Thee.

O Thou who givest grace to the humble-minded,
also give me grace to be humble-minded.

O Thou who never failest those who fear Thee,

my Fear, and my Hope,

let me fear one thing only,

the fearing ought more than Thee.

As I would that men should do to me

so may I do to them;

not to have thoughts beyond what I should think,

but to have thoughts unto sobriety.

Shine on those who sit in darkness,

and the shadow of death;

guide our feet into the way of peace,

that we may have the same thoughts

one with another,

rightly to divide, rightly to walk,
 to edify,
 with one accord, with one mouth,
 to glorify God ;
 and if ought otherwise,
 to walk in the same rule
 as far as we have attained ;
 to maintain order,
 decency and steadfastness.

(3) *Profession.* Godhead, paternal love, power,
 providence ;
 salvation, anointing, adoption,
 lordship ;
 conception, birth, passion,
 cross, death, burial,
 descent, resurrection, ascent,
 sitting, return, judgment ;
 Breath and Holiness,
 calling from the Universal,
 hallowing in the Universal,
 communion of saints, and of saintly things ¹,
 resurrection,
 life eternal.

(4) *Intercession.* Hosanna on the earth ².
 Remember, O LORD,
 to crown the year with Thy goodness ;
 for the eyes of all look towards Thee,
 and thou givest their food in due season.
 Thou openest Thine hand,
 and fillest all things living with plenteousness,
 And on us, O LORD, vouchsafe
 the blessings of heaven and the dew above,

¹ Vide above, p. 24.

² Continuation of the supplication broken by "*Profession*." Vide p. 192. edit. 1675.

blessings of fountains and the deep beneath,
 courses of sun, conjunctions of moons,
 summits of eastern mountains, of the everlasting hills,
 fulness of the earth and of produce thereof,
 good seasons, wholesome weather,
 full crops, plenteous fruits,
 health of body, peaceful times,
 mild government, kind laws,
 wise councils, equal judgments,
 loyal obedience, vigorous justice,
 fertility in resources, fruitfulness in begetting,
 ease in bearing, happiness in offspring,
 careful nurture, sound training.

That our sons may grow up as the young plants,
 our daughters as the polished corners of the temple,
 that our garners may be full and plenteous
 with all manner of store,
 that our sheep may bring forth thousands
 and ten thousands in our streets ;
 that there be no decay,
 no leading into captivity
 and no complaining in our streets.

(5) *Praise.* ¹Thou, O LORD, art praised in Sion,
 and unto Thee shall the vow be performed in Jerusalem.
 Thou art worthy, O LORD our God,
 the HOLY ONE
 to receive glory, and honour, and power.
 Thou that hearest the prayer,
 unto Thee shall all flesh come,
 my flesh shall come.
 My misdeeds prevail against me,
 O be Thou merciful unto our sins ;
 that I may come and give thanks
 with all Thy works,
 and bless Thee with Thy holy ones.

¹ Vide p. 172, edit. 1675.

O LORD, open Thou my lips,
and my mouth shall show forth Thy praise.
My soul doth praise the LORD,
for the goodness He hath done
to the whole creation,
and to the whole race of man ;
for Thy mercies towards myself,
soul, body, and estate,
gifts of grace, nature, and fortune ;
for all benefits received,
for all successes, now or heretofore,
for any benefit done ;
for health, credit, competency,
safety, gentle estate, quiet.
Thou hast not cut off as a weaver my life,
nor from day even to night made an end of me.
He hath vouchsafed me life and breath
until this hour,
from childhood, youth, and hitherto
even unto age.
He holdeth our soul in life
and suffereth not our feet to slip ;
rescuing me from perils, sicknesses,
poverty, bondage,
public shame, evil chances ;
keeping me from perishing in my sins,
fully waiting my conversion,
leaving in me return into my heart
remembrance of my latter end,
shame, horror, grief,
for my past sins ;
fuller and larger, larger and fuller,
more and still more, O my LORD,
storing me with good hope
of their remission,
through repentance and its works,
in the power of the thrice-holy Keys,
and the mysteries in Thy Church.

Wherefore day by day
for these Thy benefits towards me,
which I remember,—
wherefore also for others very many
which I have let slip
from their number, from my forgetfulness,—
for those which I wished, knew and asked,
and those I asked not, knew not, wished not,—
I confess and give thanks to Thee,
I bless and praise Thee, as is fit, and every day
I pray with my whole soul,
with my whole mind I pray.

Glory be to Thee, O LORD, glory to Thee;
glory to Thee, and glory to Thine All-holy Name,
for all Thy Divine perfections in them;
for Thine incomprehensible and unimaginable goodness,
and Thy pity towards sinners
and unworthy men,
and towards me of all sinners
far the most unworthy.

Yea, O LORD,
through this, and through the rest,
glory to Thee, and praise, and blessing and thanksgiving,
with the voices and concert of voices
of Angels and of men,
of all Thy saints in heaven,
and all Thy creatures in heaven or earth,
and of me, beneath their feet,
unworthy and wretched sinner,
Thy abject creature,
now, in this day and hour,
and every day till my last breath,
and till the end of the world,
and for ages upon ages.

THE FOURTH DAY.

Introduction. I have thought upon Thee, O LORD,
when I was waking,
for Thou hast been my helper.
Blessed art Thou, O LORD,
who madest the two Lights, Sun and Moon,
greater and lesser,
and the stars
for light, for signs, for seasons,
spring, summer, autumn, winter,
days, weeks, months, years,
to rule over day and night.

(1) *Confession.* Behold, Thou art angry, for we have sinned.
We are all as an unclean thing
and all our righteousness
as filthy rags.
We all do fade as a leaf,
and our iniquities, like the wind,
have taken us away.
But now, O LORD, Thou art our Father,
we are clay, works of Thy hands all.
Be not wroth very sore,
nor remember iniquity for ever,
behold, see, we beseech Thee,
we are all Thy people.
O LORD, though our iniquities testify against us,
do Thou it for Thy Name's sake ;
for our backslidings are many,
we have sinned against Thee.

Yet Thou, O LORD, art in the midst of us,
and we are called by Thy Name,
leave us not.

O Hope of Israel

The SAVIOUR thereof in time of trouble,
why shouldest Thou be as a stranger in the land,
and as a wayfaring man that turneth aside
to tarry for a night ?

why shouldest Thou be as a man astonished,
as a mighty man that cannot save ?

Be merciful to our unrighteousnesses,
and our iniquities remember no more.

LORD, I am carnal,

sold under sin ;

there dwelleth in me, that is in my flesh,
no good thing ;

for the good that I would, I do not,
but the evil which I would not, that I do.

I consent unto the law that it is good.

I delight in it after the inner man ;

But I see another law in my members,
warring against the law of my mind,
and enslaving me to the law of sin.

Wretched man that I am,

who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?

I thank God through JESUS CHRIST,

that when sin abounded,

grace hath much more abounded.

O LORD, Thy goodness leadeth me to repentance :

O give me sometime repentance

to recover me from the snare of the devil,
who am taken captive by him
at his will.

Sufficient for me the past time of my life
to have done the will of lusts,

walking in lasciviousness, revelling, drunkenness,

and in other excess of profligacy.
 O LAMB without blemish and without spot,
 who hast redeemed me with Thy precious Blood,
 in that very Blood pity me and save me ;
 in that Blood,
 and in that very Name,
 besides which is none other under heaven
 given among men,
 by which we must be saved.
 O GOD, Thou knowest my foolishness,
 and my sins are not hid from Thee.
 LORD, Thou knowest all my desire,
 and my groaning is not hid from Thee.
 Let not them that trust in Thee,
 O LORD GOD of hosts,
 be ashamed for my cause ;
 let not those that seek Thee be confounded through me,
 O LORD GOD of Israel.
 Take me out of the mire that I sink not ;
 O let me be delivered from them that hate me
 and out of the deep waters ;
 Let not the water flood drown me,
 neither let the deep swallow me up,
 and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me.

(2) *Prayer* [Defend me from]
for grace : Pride Amorite.

(*against* envy Hittite.
deadly wrath Perizzite.
sins.) gluttony Gergashite.
 lechery Hivite.
 (*covetousness.*) the cares of life Canaanite.
 (*sloth.*) lukewarm indifference Jebusite.

[Give me]
 Humility, pitifulness, patience,
 sobriety, purity, contentment, ready zeal.

One thing have I desired of the LORD, which I will require¹,
that I may dwell in the house of the LORD
all the days of my life,
to behold the fair beauty of the LORD,
and to visit His temple.

Two things have I required of Thee, O LORD,
deny Thou me not before I die ;
remove far from me vanity and lies ;
give me neither poverty nor riches,
feed me with food convenient for me ;
lest I be full and deny Thee
and say, who is the LORD ?
or lest I be poor and steal,
and take the Name of my God in vain.

Let me learn to abound,
let me learn to suffer need,
in whatsoever state I am
therewith to be content.

For nothing earthly, temporal, mortal,
to long nor to wait.

Grant me a happy life
in piety, gravity, purity,
in all things good and fair,
in cheerfulness, in health, in credit,
in competency, in safety, in gentle estate, in quiet ;
a happy death,
a deathless happiness.

(3) *Profession.*

I believe
in the FATHER, benevolent affection ;
in the Almighty, saving power ;
in the Creator, providence
for guarding, ruling, perfecting the universe.

¹ Vide p. 194, edit. 1675.

In JESUS, salvation,
 in CHRIST, anointing ;
 in the Only-begotten SON, sonship,
 in the LORD, a master's treatment,
 in His conception and birth
 the cleansing of our unclean conception and birth ;
 in His sufferings, which we owed, that we might not pay ;
 in His cross the curse of the law removed ;
 in His death the sting of death ;
 in His burial eternal destruction in the tomb ;
 in His descent, whither we ought, that we might not go ;
 in His resurrection, as the first fruits of them that sleep ;
 in His ascent, to prepare a place for us ;
 in His sitting, to appear and intercede ;
 in His return, to take unto Him His own ;
 in His judgment, to render to each according to his works.
 In the HOLY GHOST, power from on high,
 transforming unto sanctity
 from without and invisibly,
 yet with inward power and with evident tokens.
 In the Church, a body mystical
 of the called out of the whole world,
 unto intercourse in faith and holiness.
 In the communion of Saints, of members of this body,
 a mutual participation in holy things,
 for confidence of remission of sins ¹ ;
 for hope of resurrection, of translation,
 to life everlasting.

(4) *Intercession.* And I have hoped in Thy mercy
 from everlasting to everlasting.
 How excellent is Thy mercy, O LORD ;
 If I have hope, it is in Thy mercy,
 O let me not be disappointed of my hope.
 Moreover we beseech Thee,
 remember all, LORD, for good ;

¹ Vide above, pp. 24, 42.

have pity upon all, O SOVEREIGN LORD,
be reconciled with us all.
Give peace to the multitudes of Thy people ;
scatter offences ;
abolish wars ;
stop the uprisings of heresies.
Thy peace and love
vouchsafe to us, O GOD our SAVIOUR,
the Hope of all the ends of the earth.
Remember to crown the year
with Thy goodness ;
for the eyes of all wait upon Thee,
and Thou givest them their meat in due season.
Thou openest Thy hand,
and fillest all things living with plenteousness.
Remember Thy Holy Church,
from one end of the earth to the other ;
and give her peace,
whom Thou hast redeemed with Thy precious blood ;
and establish her
unto the end of the world.
Remember those who bear fruit, and act nobly,
in Thy holy Churches,
and who remember the poor and needy ;
recompense to them
Thy rich and heavenly gifts ;
vouchsafe to them,
for things earthly, heavenly,
for corruptible, incorruptible,
for temporal, eternal.
Remember those who are in virginity,
and purity and ascetic life ;
also those who live in honourable marriage,
in Thy reverence and fear.
Remember every Christian soul
in affliction, distress, and trial,
and in need of Thy pity and succour ;

also our brethren in captivity, prison, chains,
and bitter bondage ;
supplying return to the wandering,
health to the sick,
deliverance to the captives.

Remember religious and faithful kings,
whom Thou hast given to rule upon the earth ;
and especially remember, LORD,
our divinely-guarded king ;
strengthen his kingdom,
subdue to him all adversaries,
speak good things to his heart,
for Thy Church, and all Thy people.
Vouchsafe to him deep and undisturbed peace,
that in his serenity

we may lead a quiet and peaceable life
with all godliness and honesty.

Remember, LORD, all power
and authority,
our brethren in the court,
those who are chief in council and judgment,
and all by land and sea
waging Thy wars for us.

Moreover, LORD, remember graciously
our holy Fathers,
the honourable Presbytery, and all the clergy,
rightly dividing the Word of Truth,
and rightly walking in it.

Remember, LORD, our brethren around us,
and praying with us in this holy hour,
for their zeal and earnestness-sake.

Remember also those who on fair reasons are away,
and pity them and us
in the multitude of Thy pity.

Fill our garners with all manner of store,
preserve our wives in peace and concord,
nourish our infants,

lead forward our youth,
sustain our aged,
comfort the weak-hearted,
gather together the scattered,
restore the wanderers,
and knit them to Thy Holy Catholic Apostolic Church.
Set free the troubled
with unclean spirits,
voyage with the voyagers,
travel with the travellers,
stand forth for the widow,
shield the orphan,
rescue the captive,
heal the sick,
those who are on trial, in mines, in exile, in galleys,
in whatever affliction, necessity, and emergence,
remember, O God ;
and all who need Thy great mercy ;
and those who love us,
and those who hate ;
and those who have desired us unworthy
to make mention of them in our prayers ;
and all Thy people remember, O LORD, our GOD,
and upon all pour out Thy rich pity,
to all performing their requests for salvation ;
and those of whom we have not made mention,
through ignorance, forgetfulness, or number of names,
do Thou Thyself remember, O God,
who knowest the stature and appellation of each,
who knowest every one from his mother's womb.
For Thou art, O LORD, the Succour of the succourless,
the Hope of the hopeless,
the Saviour of the tempest-tost,
the Harbour of the voyager,
the Physician of the sick ,
do Thou Thyself become all things to all men.

O Thou who knowest each man and his petition,
each house, and its need,
deliver, O LORD, this city,
and all the country in which we sojourn,
from plague, famine, earthquake, flood,
fire, sword, hostile invasion,
and civil war.

End the schisms of the Churches,
quench the haughty cries of the nations,
and receive us all into Thy kingdom,
acknowledging us as sons of light;
and Thy peace and love
vouchsafe to us, O LORD, our God.

Remember O LORD, our God,
all spirits and all flesh
which we have remembered, and which we have not.

And the close of our life,
LORD, LORD, direct in peace,
Christianly, acceptably, and, should it please Thee,
painlessly,
gathering us together under the feet of Thine elect,
when Thou wilt and how Thou wilt,
only without shame and sins.

The brightness of the LORD our God be upon us,
prosper Thou the work of our hands upon us,
O prosper Thou our handy work.

Be, LORD,
within me to strengthen me,
without me to guard me,
over me to shelter me,
beneath me to stablish me,
before me to guide me,
after me to check me,
round about me to secure me.

(5) *Praise.* Blessed art Thou, LORD, GOD of Israel,
our FATHER,
from everlasting to everlasting.
Thine, O LORD,
is the greatness and the power,
the triumph and the victory,
the praise and the strength,
for Thou rulest over all
in heaven and on earth.
At Thy face every king is troubled,
and every nation.
Thine, O LORD, is the kingdom
and the supremacy over all,
and over all rule.
With Thee is wealth, and glory is from Thy countenance ;
Thou rulest over all, O LORD,
the Ruler of all rule ;
and in Thine hand is strength and power,
and in Thine hand to give to all things
greatness and strength.
And now, LORD, we confess to Thee,
and we praise Thy glorious Name.

THE FIFTH DAY.

Introduction. We are satisfied with Thy mercy, O LORD,
in the morning.

Blessed art Thou, O LORD,
who broughtest forth from the water
creeping things of life,
and whales,
and winged fowl.

Be Thou exalted, O God, above the heavens,
and Thy glory above all the earth.
By Thy Ascension, O LORD,
draw us too after Thee,
that we savour of what is above,
not of things on the earth.

By the marvellous mystery
of the Holy Body and precious Blood,
on the evening of this day,
LORD, have mercy.

(1) *Confession.* Thou who hast said,
"As I live, saith the LORD,
I will not the death of a sinner,
but that the ungodly return from his way
and live;
turn ye, turn ye from your wicked way,
for why will ye die, O house of Israel?"
turn us, O LORD, to Thee,
and so shall we be turned.

Turn us from all our ungodlinesses
and let them not be to us for punishments.
I have sinned, I have committed iniquity, I have done wickedly,
from Thy precepts, and Thy judgments.
To Thee, O LORD, righteousness,
and to me confusion of face,
as at this day,
in our despicableness, wherewith Thou hast despised us.
LORD, to us confusion of face,
and to our rulers
who have sinned against Thee.
LORD, in all things is Thy righteousness,
unto all Thy righteousness;
let then Thine anger and Thy fury be turned away,
and cause Thy face to shine
upon Thy servant.
O my God, incline Thine ear and hear,
open Thine eyes and see my desolation.
O LORD hear, O LORD forgive, O LORD hearken and do ;
defer not for Thine own sake, O my God,
for Thy servant is called by Thy Name.
In many things we offend all ;
LORD, let Thy mercy rejoice against Thy judgment
in my sins.
If I say I have no sin, I deceive myself,
and the truth is not in me ;
but I confess my sins many and grievous,
and Thou, O LORD, art faithful and just,
to forgive me my sins when I confess them.
Yea, for this too
I have an Advocate with Thee to Thee,
Thy Only-begotten Son, the righteous.
May He be the propitiation for my sins,
who is also for the whole world.
Will the LORD cast off for ever ?
and will He be no more intreated ?
Is His mercy clean gone for ever ?

and is His promise come utterly to an end for evermore?
 Hath God forgotten to be gracious?
 and will He shut up His loving kindness in displeasure?
 And I said, It is mine own infirmity;
 but I will remember the years of the right hand of the most
 Highest.

(2) *Prayer
 for grace.*

[Give me grace]
 to put aside every weight,
 and the sin that doth so easily beset us;
 all filthiness
 and superfluity of naughtiness,
 lust of the flesh, of the eyes,
 pride of life,
 every motion of flesh and spirit
 alienated from the will of Thy sanctity:
 to be poor in spirit,
 that I may have a portion in the kingdom of heaven;
 to mourn, that I may be comforted;
 to be meek, that I may inherit the earth;
 to hunger and thirst for righteousness, that I may be filled;
 to be pitiful, that I may be pitied;
 to be pure in heart, that I may see God;
 to be a peace-maker, that I may be called the son of God;
 to be prepared for persecutions and revilings
 for righteousness' sake,
 so that my reward may be in heaven,—
 all this, grant to Me, O LORD.

(3) *Profession.*

I, coming to God,
 believe that He is,
 and that He is a rewarder of them
 that diligently seek Him.
 I know that my Redeemer liveth,
 that He is CHRIST, the SON of the Living God,
 that He is truly the SAVIOUR of the world,
 that He came into the world to save sinners,

of whom I am chief.
Through the grace of **JESUS CHRIST**
we believe that we shall be saved
like as our fathers.
I know that my skin shall rise up upon the earth,
which undergoes these things.
I believe to see the goodness of the **LORD**
in the land of the living.
Our heart shall rejoice in Him,
because we have hoped in His holy Name ;
in the Name of the Father,
of the Saviour, Mediator, Intercessor, Redeemer,
of the two-fold Comforter,
under the figures of the Lamb and the Dove.
Let thy merciful kindness, O **LORD**, be upon us,
like as we do put our trust in Thee.

(4) *Intercession.* Let us beseech the **LORD** in peace,
for the heavenly peace,
and the salvation of our souls ;—
for the peace of the whole world ;
for the stability of God's holy Churches,
and the union of them all ;—
for this holy house,
and those who enter it with faith and reverence ;
for our holy Fathers,
the honourable Presbytery, the Diaconate in **CHRIST**,
and all, both clergy and people ;—
for this holy retreat, and all the city and country,
and all the faithful who dwell therein ;—
for salubrious weather, fruitfulness of earth,
and peaceful times ;—
for voyagers, travellers,
those who are in sickness, toil, and captivity,
and for their salvation.
Aid, save, pity, and preserve them,
O God, in Thy grace.

Making mention
 of the all-holy, undefiled, and more than blessed
 Mary, Mother of God and Ever-Virgin,
 with all saints,
 let us commend ourselves, and each other, and all our life,
 to CHRIST our GOD.
 To Thee, O LORD, for 'it is fitting,
 be glory, honour, and worship.
 The grace of our LORD, JESUS CHRIST,
 and the love of God,
 and the communion of the HOLY GHOST,
 be with me, and with all of us. Amen.
 I commend me and mine, and all that belongs to me,
 to Him who is able to keep me without a fall,
 and to place me immaculate
 before the presence of His glory,
 to the only wise GOD and our SAVIOUR ;
 to whom be glory and greatness,
 strength and authority,
 both now and for all ages. Amen.

(5) *Praise.*

O LORD, my LORD,
 for my being, life, reason,
 for nurture, protection, government,
 for education, civil rights, religion,
 for Thy gifts of grace, nature, fortune,
 for redemption, regeneration, catechising,
 for my call, recall, yea, many calls besides ;
 for Thy forbearance, long-suffering, long long-suffering
 to me-ward,
 many seasons, many years, up to this time ;
 for all benefits received, successes granted me, benefits done ;
 for the use of things present,
 for Thy promise, and my hope
 of the enjoyment of good things to come ;
 for my parents honest and good,
 teachers kind,
 benefactors never to be forgotten,

religious intimates congenial,
hearers thoughtful,
friends sincere,
domestics faithful,
for all who have advantaged me
by writings, homilies, converse,
prayers, patterns, rebukes, injuries ;
for all these, and all others
which I know, which I know not,
open, hidden,
remembered, forgotten,
done when I wished, when I wished not,
I confess to Thee and will confess, and bless Thee and will bless,
I give thanks to Thee and will give thanks,
all the days of my life.
Who am I, or what is my father's house,
that Thou shouldst look upon a dead dog,
the like of me ?
What reward shall I give unto the LORD
for all the benefits which He hath done unto me ?
What thanks can I recompense unto God,
for all He had spared and borne with me until now ?
Holy, Holy, Holy,
worthy art Thou,
O LORD and our God, the Holy One,
to receive the glory, and the honour, and the power,
for Thou hast made all things,
and for Thy pleasure they are,
and were created.

THE SIXTH DAY.

Introduction. Early shall my prayer come before Thee.

Blessed art Thou, O LORD,
who broughtest forth of the earth, wild beasts, cattle,
and all the reptiles,
for food, clothing, help ;
and madest man after Thine image, to rule the earth,
and blessedst him.

The fore-counsel, fashioning hand,
breath of life, image of God,
appointment over the works,
charge to the Angels concerning him,
paradise.

Heart, reins, eyes, ears, tongue, hands, feet,
life, sense, reason, spirit, free will, mercy, conscience,
the revelation of God, writing of the law,
oracles of prophets, music of psalms,
instruction of proverbs, experience of histories,
worship of sacrifices.

Blessed art Thou, O LORD,
for Thy great and precious promise
on this day
concerning the Life-giving Seed,
and for its fulfilment in fulness of the times
at this day.

Blessed art Thou, O LORD,
for the holy passion

of this day.
O by Thy salutary sufferings
on this day,
save us, O LORD.

(1) *Confession.* I have withstood Thee, LORD,
but I return to Thee; (Hosea.)
for I have fallen by mine iniquity.

But I take with me words,
and I return unto Thee and say,
take away all iniquity and receive us graciously,
so will we render the calves of our lips.
Spare us, LORD, spare, (Joel.)
and give not Thine heritage to reproach,
to Thine enemies.

LORD, LORD, be propitious,
cease, I beseech Thee, (Amos.)
by whom shall Jacob arise?
for he is small.

Repent, O LORD, for this,
and this shall not be.
While observing lying vanities (Jonah.)
I forsook my own mercy,
and am cast out of Thy sight,
When my soul fainted within me,
I remembered the LORD;

yet will I look again toward Thy Holy Temple;
Thou hast brought up my life from corruption.
Who is a God like unto Thee, (Micah.)
that pardoneth iniquity
to the remnant of His heritage?

He retaineth not His anger for ever,
because He delighteth in mercy.
Turn again and have compassion upon us, O LORD,
subdue our iniquities,
and cast all our sins into the depths of the sea
according to Thy truth, and according to Thy mercy.

O LORD I have heard Thy speech and was afraid, (*Habakkuk.*)
in wrath remember mercy.

Behold me, LORD, clothed in filthy garments ; (*Zechariah.*)
behold Satan standing at my right hand ;

yet, O LORD, by the blood of Thy covenant,
by the fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness,

take away my iniquity
and cleanse me from my sin.

Save me as a brand
plucked out of the fire.

Father, forgive me, for I know not,
truly I know not, what I have done
in sinning against Thee.

LORD, remember me
when Thou comest in Thy kingdom.

LORD, lay not mine enemies' sins to their charge,

LORD, lay not my own to mine.

By Thy sweat bloody and heavy,
Thy soul in agony,

Thy head crowned with thorns, bruised with staves,
Thine eyes swimming with tears,

Thine ears full of insults,

Thy mouth moistened with vinegar and gall,

Thy face dishonourably stained with spitting,

Thy neck weighed down with the burden of the cross,

Thy back ploughed with the wheals and gashes of the scourge,

Thy hands and feet stabbed through,

Thy strong cry, *Eli, Eli,*

Thy heart pierced with the spear,
the water and blood thence flowing,

Thy body broken,

Thy blood poured out,

LORD, forgive the offence of Thy servant,
and cover all his sins.

Turn away all Thy displeasure,
and turn Thyself from Thy wrathful indignation.

Turn me then, O GOD our SAVIOUR,
and let Thine anger cease from us.
Wilt Thou be displeased at us for ever,
and stretch out Thy wrath from one generation to another ?
Wilt Thou not turn again and quicken us,
that Thy people may rejoice in Thee ?
Show us Thy mercy, O LORD,
and grant us Thy salvation.

(2) *Prayer for grace.*

[Save me from]

the works of the flesh,
adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness,
idolatry, witchcraft,
enmities, strifes,
emulations, heats,
quarrels, parties,
heresies, envyings, murders,
drunkennesses, revellings, and such like.

[Grant me]

the fruits of the SPIRIT,
love, joy, peace,
long-suffering, gentleness, goodness,
faith, meekness, temperance ;
the spirit of wisdom, of understanding,
of counsel, of might,
of knowledge, and of godliness,
of fear of the LORD :—
and the gifts of the SPIRIT,
the word of wisdom, of knowledge,
faith, gifts of healing, working of miracles,
prophecy, discerning of spirits,
kinds of tongues, interpretation of tongues.
May Thy strong hand, O LORD ¹,
become my defence ;
Thy mercy in CHRIST
my salvation ;

¹ Vide p. 146, edit. 1675.

Thy all-veritable word,
 my instructor ;
 the grace of Thy life-bringing Spirit,
 my consolation,
 all along, and at last.
 The Soul of CHRIST hallow me,
 and the Body strengthen me,
 and the Blood ransom me,
 and the Water wash me,
 and the Bruises heal me,
 and the Sweat refresh me,
 and the Wound hide me.
 The peace of God
 which passeth all understanding,
 keep my heart and thoughts
 in the knowledge and the love of God.

(3) Profession.

I believe
 that Thou hast created me ;
 despise not the work of Thine own hands ;—
 that Thou madest me after Thine image and likeness,
 suffer not Thy likeness to be blotted out ;—
 that Thou hast redeemed me in Thy blood,
 suffer not the cost of that redemption to perish ;
 that Thou hast called me Christian after Thy Name,
 disdain not Thine own title ;
 that Thou hast hallowed me in regeneration,
 destroy not Thy holy work ;—
 that Thou hast grafted me into the good olive tree,
 the member of Thy mystical body ;
 the member of Thy mystical body
 cut not off. .
 O think upon Thy servant as concerning Thy word,
 wherein Thou hast caused me to put my trust,
 my soul hath longed for Thy salvation,
 and I have good hope because of Thy word,

(4) *Intercession.*

[I pray]

for the prosperous advance and good condition
of all the Christian army,
against the enemies of our most holy faith ;
for our holy fathers,
and all our brotherhood in CHRIST ;
for those who hate and those who love us,
for those who pity and those who minister to us ;
for those whom we have promised
to remember in prayer ;
for the liberation of captives ;
for our fathers and brethren absent ;
for those who voyage by sea ;
for those who lie in sickness.

Let us pray also for fruitfulness of the earth ;
and for every soul of orthodox Christians.

Let us bless pious kings,
orthodox high-priests,
the founders of this holy retreat,
our parents,
and all our forefathers
and our brethren departed.

(5) *Praise.* Thou who, on man's transgressing Thy command,
and falling,

didst not pass him by, nor leave him, God of goodness ;
but didst visit in ways manifold,
as a tender Father,

supplying him with Thy great and precious promise,
concerning the Life-giving Seed,
opening to him the door of faith,
and of repentance unto life,
and in fulness of the times,
sending Thy CHRIST Himself
to take on Him the seed of Abraham ;
and, in the oblation of His life,
to fulfil the Law's obedience ;

and, in the sacrifice of His death,
 to take off the Law's curse ;
 and, in His death,
 to redeem the world ;
 and, in His resurrection,
 to quicken it :—

O Thou, who doest all things,
 whereby to bring again our race to Thee,
 that it may be partaker
 of Thy divine nature and eternal glory ;
 who hast borne witness
 to the truth of Thy gospel
 by many and various wonders,
 in the ever-memorable converse of Thy saints,
 in their supernatural endurance of torments,
 in the overwhelming conversion of all lands
 to the obedience of faith,
 without might, or persuasion, or compulsion :—

Blessed be Thy Name,
 and praised and celebrated,
 and magnified, and high exalted,
 and glorified, and hallowed ;
 its record, and its memory,
 and every memorial of it,
 both now and for evermore.

Worthy art Thou to take the book,
 and to open the seals thereof,
 for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God
 by Thy blood,
 out of every kindred and tongue,
 and people, and nation.

Worthy is the Lamb that was slain
 to receive the power, and riches, and wisdom,
 and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.

To Him that sitteth upon the Throne,
 and to the Lamb,
 be the blessing, and the honour, and the glory, and the might,

for ever and ever. Amen.

Salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the throne,
and to the Lamb.

Amen : the blessing and the glory, and the wisdom,
and the thanksgiving and the honour,
and the power and the strength,
be unto our God,
for ever and ever,
Amen.

THE SEVENTH DAY.

Introduction. O LORD, be gracious unto us,
we have waited for Thee ;
be Thou our arm every morning,
our salvation also in the time of trouble.
Blessed art Thou, O LORD,
who restedst on the seventh day
from all Thy works,
and blessedst and sanctifiedst it :
[concerning the Sabbath,
concerning the Christian rest instead of it,
concerning the funeral rites of CHRIST,
and the resting from sin,
concerning those who are already gone to rest.]

(1) *Confession.* I am ashamed, and blush, O my God,
to lift up my face to Thee,
for mine iniquities are increased
over my head,
and my trespass is grown up unto the heavens ;
since the days of youth
have I been in a great trespass
unto this day ;
I cannot stand before Thee because of this.
My sins are more in number than the sand of the sea,
my iniquities are multiplied,
and I not worthy to look up
and see the height of heaven,
from the number of my unrighteousnesses ;
and I have no relief,

because I have provoked Thine anger,
and done evil in Thy sight;
not doing Thy will,
not keeping Thy commandments.
And now my heart pants for Thee,
beseeching Thy goodness.

I have sinned, O LORD, I have sinned,
and I know mine iniquities;
and I ask and beseech,
remit to me, O LORD, remit to me,
and destroy me not in mine iniquities;
nor be thou angry for ever,
or reserve evil for me;
nor condemn me
in the lowest parts of the earth.

Because Thou art God, the God of penitents,
and Thou shalt show in me all Thy loving-kindness;
for Thou shalt save me unworthy,
according to Thy much pity,
and I will praise Thee alway.

LORD, if Thou wilt, Thou canst cleanse me;
LORD, only say the word, and I shall be healed.

LORD, save me;

Carest Thou not that we perish?

Say to me, be of good cheer, Thy sins are remitted to thee.

JESU, Master, have mercy on me;

Thou Son of David, JESU, have mercy on me;

JESU, Son of David, Son of David.

LORD, say to me, Ephphatha.

LORD, I have no man¹;

LORD say to me, be loosed from thine infirmity.

Say unto my soul, I am thy salvation.

Say unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee.

LORD, how long wilt Thou be angry?
shall Thy jealousy burn like fire for ever?

¹ John v. 7.

O, remember not our old sins ;
 but have mercy on us and that soon,
 for we are come to great misery ;
 Help us, O God of our salvation ;
 for the glory of Thy Name.
 O deliver us and be merciful unto our sins,
 for Thy Name's sake.

(2) *Prayer
 for grace.*

[O LORD, remit]
 all my failings, shortcomings, falls,
 stumblings, offences, scandals,
 transgressions, debts, sins,
 faults, ignorances, iniquities,
 impieties, unrighteousnesses, pollutions.

The guilt of them,
 be gracious unto, pardon ;
 remit, forgive ;
 be propitious unto, spare ;
 impute not, charge not, remember not.

The stain
 pass by, pass over ;
 disregard, overlook ;
 hide wash away ;
 blot out cleanse.

The hurt
 remit, heal, remedy ;
 take off, remove, away with ;
 abolish, annul, disperse, annihilate ;
 that they be not found, that they exist not.

Supply
 to faith, virtue ;
 to virtue, knowledge ;
 to knowledge, continence ;
 to continence, patience ;
 to patience, godliness ;
 to godliness, brotherly love ;
 to brotherly love, charity.

That I forget not my cleansing from my former sins,
but give diligence to make my calling and election sure
through good works.

- (3) *Profession.* I believe in Thee the FATHER ;
Behold then, if Thou a Father and we sons,
as a father pitieth sons,
be Thou of tender mercy towards us, O LORD.
I believe in Thee, the LORD ;
behold then, if thou art LORD and we servants,
our eyes are upon Thee our LORD,
until Thou have mercy upon us.
I believe, that though we be neither sons nor servants,
but dogs only,
yet we have leave to eat of the crumbs
that fall from Thy Table.
I believe that CHRIST is the Lamb of God ;
O Lamb of God that takest away the sins of the world,
take Thou away mine.
I believe that JESUS CHRIST came into the world
to save sinners ;
Thou who camest to save sinners
save Thou me, of sinners
chief and greatest.
I believe that CHRIST came to save what was lost ;
Thou who camest to save the lost,
never suffer, O LORD, that to be lost which Thou hast saved.
I believe that the SPIRIT is the Lord and Giver of life ;
Thou who gavest me a living soul,
give me not to receive my soul in vain.
I believe that the SPIRIT gives grace
in His sacred things ;
give me not to receive His grace in vain,
nor hope of His sacred things.
I believe that the SPIRIT intercedes for us
with plaints unutterable ;
grant me of His intercession and those plaints

to partake, O LORD.

Our fathers hoped in Thee,
they trusted in Thee, and Thou didst deliver them.

They called upon Thee and were holpen,
they put their trust in Thee, and were not confounded.

As Thou didst our fathers
in the generations of old,
so also deliver us, O LORD,
who trust in Thee.

(4) *Intercession.*

O Heavenly KING,
confirm our faithful kings,
establish the faith,
soften the nations,
pacify the world,
guard well this holy retreat,
and receive us in orthodox faith and repentance,
as a kind and loving Lord.

The power of the FATHER guide me,
the wisdom of the SON enlighten me,
the working of the SPIRIT quicken me.

Guard Thou my soul,
establish my body,
elevate my senses,
direct my converse,
form my habits,
bless my actions,
fulfil my prayers,
inspire holy thoughts,
pardon the past,
correct the present,
prevent the future.

(5) *Praise.*

Now unto Him that is able to do
exceeding abundantly
above all that we ask or think,
according to the power that worketh in us,

to Him be glory
in the Church in CHRIST
unto all generations
world without end. Amen.

Blessed, and praised, and celebrated,
and magnified, and exalted, and glorified, and hallowed,
be Thy Name, O LORD,
its record, and its memory,
and every memorial of it ;
for the all-honourable senate of the Patriarchs,
the ever-venerable band of the Prophets,
the all-glorious college of the Apostles,
the Evangelists,
the all-illustrious army of the Martyrs,
the Confessors,
the assembly of Doctors,
the Ascetics,
the beauty of Virgins,
for Infants the delight of the world,—
for their faith, their hope,
their labours, their truth,
their blood, their zeal,
their diligence, their tears,
their purity, their beauty.

Glory to Thee, O LORD, glory to Thee,
glory to Thee who didst glorify them,
among whom we too glorify Thee.
Great and marvellous are Thy works,
LORD, the GOD ALMIGHTY,
just and true are Thy ways,
O King of Saints.

Who shall not fear Thee, O LORD,
and glorify Thy Name ?
for Thou only art Holy,
for all the nations shall come and worship before Thee,
for Thy judgments are made manifest.

Praise our God, all ye His servants,
and ye that fear Him,
both small and great.

Alleluia,

for the LORD God Omnipotent reigneth ;
let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to Him.

Behold the tabernacle of God is with men,
and He will dwell with them ;
and they shall be His people,
and God Himself shall be with them,
and shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.

And there shall be no more death ;
neither crying, neither pain any more,
for the former things are passed away.

DEPRECATIONS.

1.

O LORD¹, Thou knowest, and canst, and wilt
the good of my soul.
Miserable man am I ;
I neither know, nor can, nor, as I ought,
will it.
Thou, O LORD, I beseech Thee,
in Thine ineffable affection,
so order concerning me,
and so dispose,
as Thou knowest to be most pleasing to Thee,
and most good for me.
[Thine is]
goodness, grace ;
love, kindness ;
benignity, gentleness, consideration ;
forbearance, long suffering ;
much pity, great pity ;
mercies, multitude of mercies, yearnings of mercies ;
kind yearnings, deep yearnings ;
in passing over,
in overlooking, in disregarding ;
many seasons, many years ;
[punishing] unwillingly, not willingly ;
not to the full,
not correspondently,
remembering mercy in wrath,
repenting of the evil,

¹ Vide p. 92, edit. 1675.

compensating doubly,
 ready to pardon,
 to be reconciled,
 to be appeased.

2.

LITANY ¹.

FATHER, the Creator,
 SON, the Redeemer,
 SPIRIT, the Regenerator,
 destroy me not,
 whom Thou hast created, redeemed, regenerated.
 Remember not, LORD, my sins,
 nor the sins of my forefathers ;
 neither take vengeance for our sins, theirs or mine.
 Spare us, LORD, them and me ²,
 spare Thy people,
 and, among Thy people, Thy servant,
 who is redeemed with Thy precious blood ;
 and be not angry with us for ever.
 Be merciful, be merciful ; spare us, LORD,
 and be not angry with us for ever.
 Be merciful, be merciful ; have pity on us, LORD,
 and be not angry with us to the full.

¹ Page 180, edit. 1675.

² Thus in St. Gregory's Sacramentary.—“*Præsta, quæsumus, omnipotens Deus, ut animam famuli, &c. . . in congregatione justorum æternæ beatitudinis jubeas esse consortem. Per Dominum, &c.*” “*Præsta, &c. ut animam, &c. ab angelis lucis susceptam in præparata habitacula deduci facias beatorum. Per Dominum, &c.*” “*Suscipe, Domine, preces nostras, pro anima famuli tui . . . ut si quæ ei maculæ de terrenis contagiiis adhæserunt, remissionis tuæ remedio deleantur.*” For similar language in the second century vide *Ussher* as quoted in *Tract 72*.

Deal not, O LORD,
deal not with me after mine iniquities,
neither recompense me according to my sins ;
but after Thy great pity,
deal with me,
and according to the multitude of Thy mercies,
recompense me ;
after that so great pity,
and that multitude of mercies,
as Thou didst to our fathers
in the times of old ;—
by all that is dear unto Thee.

From all evil and adversity,
in all time of need ;
from this evil and this adversity,
in this time ;
raise me, rescue me, save me, O LORD.
Deliver me, O LORD,
and destroy me not.
On the bed of sickness ;
in the hour of death ;
in the day of judgment,
in that dreadful and fearful day,
rescue me, LORD, and save me ;—
from seeing the Judge's face overcast,
from being placed on the left,
from hearing the dreadful word, Depart from Me,
from being bound in chains of darkness,
from being cast into the outer darkness,
from being tormented in the pit of fire and brimstone,
where the smoke of the torments
ascendeth for ever.
Be merciful, be merciful,
spare us, pity us,
O LORD ;

and destroy us not for ever,
 deliver and save us.
 Let it not be, O LORD ; and that it be not,
 take away from me, O LORD,
 hardness of heart,
 desperateness after sinning,
 blindness of heart,
 contempt of Thy threats,
 a cauterized conscience,
 a reprobate mind,
 the sin against the HOLY GHOST,
 the sin unto death,
 the four crying sins ¹ ;
 the six which forerun ²
 the sin against the HOLY GHOST.

Deliver me
 from all ills and abominations of this world,
 from plague, famine, and war ;
 earthquake, flood, and fire,
 the stroke of immoderate rain and drought,
 blast and blight ;
 thunder, lightning and tempest ;
 epidemic sickness, acute and malignant,
 unexpected death ;
 from ills and difficulties in the Church,
 from private interpretation,
 from innovation in things sacred,
 from heterodox teaching ;
 from unhealthy inquiries and interminable disputes,
 from heresies, schisms, scandals,
 public and private,
 from making gods ³ of kings,

¹ Wilful murder, the sin of Sodom, oppressing the poor, defrauding workmen of their wages.

² Despair of salvation, presumption of God's mercy, impugning known truth, envy at another's grace, obstinacy in sin, and impenitence.

³ Τῆς ἀποθεώσεως, vid. Acts xii. 22. Mr. Waller "going to see

from flattering of the people,
 from the indifference of Saul,
 from the scorn of Michal,
 from the greediness of Hophni,
 from the plunder of Athaliah,
 from the priesthood of Micah,
 from the brotherhood of Simon and Judas,
 from the doctrine of men unlearned and unestablished,
 from the pride of novices,
 from the people resisting the priest :—
 from ills and difficulties in the state,
 from anarchy, many rulers, tyranny,
 from Ashur, Jeroboam, Rehoboam, Gallio, Haman,
 the profligacy of Ahithophel,
 the foolishness of Zoan¹,
 the statutes of Omri,
 the justice of Jezebel,
 the overflowings of Belial,²
 the courage of Peor,
 the valley of Achor,
 pollution of blood or seed,
 incursion of enemies,
 civil war,
 bereavement of good governors,
 accession of evil and unprincipled governors ;
 from an intolerable life,

the king at dinner, overheard a very extraordinary conversation between his Majesty [King James] and two prelates, the Bishop of Winchester [Andrews] and Dr. Neale, Bishop of Durham, who were standing behind the king's chair. His Majesty asked the bishops, 'My lords, cannot I take my subjects' money when I want it, without all this formality in parliament?' The Bishop of Durham readily answered, 'God forbid, Sir, but you should; you are the breath of our nostrils.' Whereupon the king turned and said to the Bishop of Winchester, 'Well, my lord, what say you?' 'Sir,' replied the bishop, 'I have no skill to judge of Parliamentary cases.' The king answered, 'No put-offs, my lord, answer me presently.' 'Then, Sir,' said he, 'I think it lawful for you to take my brother Neale's money, for he offers it.'—Waller's Life, quoted in Biograph. Brit.

¹ Isai. xix.

² Ps. xviii. 4.

Deprecation.

in despondence, sickness, ill fame,
distress, peril, slavery, restlessness :
from death

in sin, shame, tortures,
desperateness, defilement, violence, treachery ;
from death unexpected,
from death eternal.

FORMS OF INTERCESSION.

1¹.

For all creatures,
 men,
 persons compassed with
 infirmity.
 Churches
 Catholic,
 Eastern,
 Western,
 British.
 The Episcopate,
 Presbytery,
 clergy,
 Christian people.
 States
 of the whole earth,
 Christian,
 neighbouring,
 our own.
 Rulers,
 kings,
 religious kings,
 our own,
 councillors,
 judges,
 nobles,
 soldiers,
 sailors,

the people,
 the rising generation,
 schools,
 those at court,
 in cities,
 the country.
 Those who serve the soul,
 those who serve the body,
 in food,
 clothing,
 health,
 necessities.
 [Those who have a claim on
 my prayers,]
 in nature,
 by benefits,
 from trust,
 formerly or now,
 in friendship,
 in love,
 in neighbourhood;
 from promise,
 from mutual offices,
 from want of leisure,
 from destitution,
 from extremity.

¹ Vide p. 90, edit. 1675.

3¹.

The creation, the race of man,
all in affliction and in prosperity,
in error, and in truth,
in sin, and in grace ;
the Church Ecumenical,
Eastern, Western, our own,
Rulers, Clergy, people.
States of the earth,
Christian, neighbouring, our own,
the King, the Queen, the Prince,
the nobles.
Parliament, Law Courts, army, police.
The Commons,
farmers, merchants, artisans,
down to mean workmen,
and poor.
Those who have a claim on me,
from kindred,
benefaction,
ministration of things temporal,
charge formerly or now,
natural kindness,
Christian love,
neighbourhood,
promise on my part,
their own desire,
their lack of leisure,
sympathy for their extreme misery ;
any good work,
any noble action,
any scandal from me,
having none to pray for them.

¹ Vide p. 206, edit. 1875.

4¹.

World,	earth inhabited.
Church, throne,	kingdom, altar.
Council-chamber, schools,	law courts, work places.
Infants, the grown, men, aged,	boys, youths, elderly, decrepit.
The possessed, sick, orphans, foreigners, travellers, with such in bitter bondage, overladen.	weak-hearted, prisoners, widows, voyagers, who give suck, in desolateness,

¹ Vide p. 201, edit. 1875.

MEDITATIONS.

1. *On Christian Duty.*

What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?

Keep the commandments. *Mark* x. 17.

What shall we do?

Repent and be baptized every one of you. *Acts* ii. 37, 38.

What must I do to be saved?

Believe on the LORD JESUS CHRIST. *Acts* xvi. 31.

What shall we do then?

(To the multi- He who hath two coats, let him impart to him
tude.) that hath none.

He that hath meat, let him do likewise.

(To the publicans.) Exact no more than is appointed you.

(To soldiers.) Do violence to no man; neither accuse any falsely;
be content with your wages. *Luke* iii. 10—14.

The knowledge and faith
of [God's] justice [God's] mercy
[leads] unto

fear,	hope,
abasement,	consolation,
repentance,	thanksgiving,
fasting,	almsgiving,
prayers,	hymns,
patience,	obedience,
a sacrifice ¹ ,	an oblation.

¹ *E. g.* Concede nobis, Domine Deus noster, ut hæc hostia salutaris, et nostrorum fiat purgatio delictorum, et tuæ propitiatio Majestatis, per, &c.
—St. Gregory's Lib. Sacrament. p. 57.

2. *On the Day of Judgment.*

FATHER Unoriginate, Only-begotten SON,
 Life-giving SPIRIT,
 merciful, pitiful, long suffering,
 full of pity, full of kind yearnings,
 who lovest the just and pitiest the sinful,
 who passest by sins and grantest petitions,

God of penitents,
 SAVIOUR of sinners,
 I have sinned before Thee, O LORD,
 and thus and thus have I done.

Alas, alas ! woe, woe.
 How was I enticed by my own lust !
 How I hated instruction !
 Nor felt I fear nor shame at
 Thy incomprehensible glory,
 Thy awful presence,
 Thy fearful power,
 Thy exact justice,
 Thy winning goodness.

I will call if there be any that will answer me ;
 to which of the Saints shall I turn ?
 O wretched man that I am,
 who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?
 how fearful is Thy judgment, O LORD ?
 when the thrones are set
 and Angels stand around,
 and men are brought in,
 the books opened,
 the works inquired into,
 the thoughts examined
 and the hidden things of darkness.
 What judgment shall be upon me ?
 who shall quench my flame ?
 who shall lighten my darkness,
 if Thou pity me not ?

LORD, as Thou art loving,
give me tears,
give me floods, give me to-day.
For then will be the incorruptible Judge,
the horrible judgment-seat,
the answer without excuses,
the inevitable charges,
the shameful punishment,
the endless Gehenna,
the pitiless angels,
the yawning hell,
the roaring stream of fire,
the unquenchable flame,
the dark prison,
the rayless darkness,
the bed of live coals,
the unwearied worm,
the indissoluble chains,
the bottomless chaos,
the impassable wall,
the inconsolable cry,
none to stand by me,
none to plead for me,
none to snatch me out.
But I repent, LORD, O LORD, I repent,
help Thou mine impenitence,
and more, and still more,
pierce, rend, crush my heart.
Behold, O LORD, that I am
indignant with myself,
for my senseless, profitless,
hurtful, perilous passions;
that I lothe myself,
for these inordinate, unseemly,
deformed, insincere,
shameful, disgraceful
passions,

that my confusion is daily before me,
and the shame of my face hath covered me.

Alas! woe, woe—

O me, how long?

Behold, LORD, that I sentence myself
to punishment everlasting,
yea, and all miseries of this world.

Behold me, LORD, self-condemned:

Behold, LORD, and enter not into judgment with Thy servant.

And now, LORD,

I humble myself under Thy mighty hand.

I bend to Thee, O LORD, my knees,

I fall on my face to the earth.

Let this cup pass from me!

I stretch forth my hands unto Thee;

I smite my breast, I smite on my thigh.

Out of the deep my soul crieth unto Thee,

as a thirsty land;

and all my bones,

and all that is within me.

LORD, hear my voice.

3. *On Human Frailness.*

Have mercy on me, LORD, for I am weak;

remember, LORD, how short my time is;

remember that I am but flesh,

a wind that passeth away, and cometh not again.

My days are as grass, as a flower of the field;

for the wind goeth over me, and I am gone,

and my place shall know me no more.

I am dust and ashes,

earth and grass,

flesh and breath,

corruption and the worm,

a stranger upon the earth,

dwelling in a house of clay,

few and evil my days,
to-day, and not to-morrow,
in the morning, yet not until night,
in a body of sin,
in a world of corruption,
of few days, and full of trouble,
coming up, and cut down like a flower,
and as a shadow, having no stay.
Remember this, O LORD, and suffer, remit ;
what profit is there in my blood,
when I go down to the pit ?
By the multitude of Thy mercies,
by the riches and excessive redundancy
of Thy pity ;
by all that is dear to Thee,
all that we should plead,
and before and beyond all things, by Thyself,
by Thyself, O LORD, and by Thy CHRIST,
LORD, have mercy upon me, the chief of sinners.
O my LORD, let Thy mercy
rejoice against Thy judgment in my sin.
O LORD, hear, O LORD, forgive,
O LORD, hearken,
O LORD, hearken and do,
do and defer not for Thine own sake,
defer not, O LORD my God.

FOR HOLY COMMUNION.

O LORD,

I am not worthy, I am not fit,
that Thou shouldst come under the roof
of my soul ;
for it is all desolate and ruined ;
nor hast Thou in me fitting place
to lay Thy head.

But, as Thou didst vouchsafe
to lie in the cavern and manger of brute cattle,
as Thou didst not disdain
to be entertained in the house of Simon the leper,
as Thou didst not disdain
that harlot, like me, who was a sinner,
coming to Thee and touching Thee ;
as Thou abhorredst not
her polluted and loathsome mouth ;
nor the thief upon the cross
confessing Thee :

So me too the ruined, wretched,
and excessive sinner ;
deign to receive to the touch and partaking
of the immaculate, supernatural, lifegiving,
and saving mysteries
of Thy all-holy Body
and Thy precious Blood.

Listen, O LORD, our GOD,
from Thy holy habitation,
and from the glorious throne of Thy kingdom,
and come to sanctify us.

O Thou who sittest on high with the FATHER,
and art present with us here invisibly ;
come Thou to sanctify the gifts which lie before Thee,
and those in whose behalf, and by whom,
and the things for which,
they are brought near Thee.
And grant to us communion,
unto faith without shame,
love without dissimulation ;
fulfilment of Thy commandments,
alacrity for every spiritual fruit ;
hindrance of all adversity,
healing of soul and body ;
that we too, with all Saints,
who have been well-pleasing to Thee from the beginning,
may become partakers
of Thy incorrupt and everlasting goods,
which Thou hast prepared, O LORD, for them that love Thee ;
in whom Thou art glorified
for ever and ever.

Lamb of God,
that takest away the sin of the world,
take away the sin of me,
the utter sinner.

[Unto a pledge of communion. *Acts* ii. 42.
A memorial of the Dispensation. *Eph.* iii. 2.
A showing forth of His death. *1 Cor.* xi. 26.
A communion of Body and Blood. *Luke* xxii. 19.
A sharing in the Spirit. *1 Cor.* xii. 13.
Remission of sins. *Matt.* xxvi. 28.
A riddance of things contrary. *1 Cor.* v. 7.
Rest of conscience. *Matt.* xi. 29.

Blotting out of debts. *Col.* ii. 14.
 Cleansing of stains. *Heb.* ix. 14.
 Healing of the soul's sicknesses. *1 Peter* ii. 24.
 Renewing of the covenant. *Psalms* ii. 5.
 Food of spiritual life. *John* vi. 27.
 Increase of strengthening grace. *Heb.* xiii. 9.
 And of winning consolation. *Luke* ii. 25.
 Compunction of penitence. *2 Cor.* vii. 9.
 Illumination of mind. *Luke* xxiv. 31.
 Exercise of humility. *1 Peter* v. 5.
 Seal of faith. *2 Cor.* i. 22.
 Fulness of wisdom. *Rom.* xi. 33.
 Bond of love. *John* xiii. 35.
 Call for a collection. *1 Cor.* xvi. 1.
 A means of endurance. *1 Peter* iv. 1.
 Liveliness of thanksgiving. *Psalms* cxvi. 12.
 Confidence of prayer. *Ibid.* 13.
 Mutual indwelling. *John* vi. 56.
 Pledge of the resurrection. *Ibid.* 34.
 Acceptable defence in judgment. *Luke* xiv. 18.
 Covenant of the inheritance. *Luke* xxii. 20.
 Figure of perfection. *John* xvii. 23.]

We then remembering too, O sovereign LORD,
 in the presence of Thy holy mysteries,
 the salutary passion of Thy CHRIST,
 His lifegiving cross,
 most precious death,
 three days sepulture,
 resurrection from the dead,
 ascent into heaven,
 session at the right hand of Thee, the FATHER,
 His fearful and glorious coming ;
 we beseech Thee, O LORD,
 that we, receiving in the pure testimony
 of our conscience,
 our portion of Thy sacred things,

may be made one with the holy Body and Blood
of Thy CHRIST ;
and receiving them not unworthily,
we may hold CHRIST indwelling in our hearts,
and may become a temple
of Thy HOLY SPIRIT.

Yea, O our God,
nor make any of us guilty
of Thy dreadful and heavenly mysteries,
nor infirm in soul or body
from partaking of them unworthily.

But grant us
until our last and closing breath,
worthily to receive a hope of Thy holy things,
for sanctification, enlightening, strengthening,
a relief of the weight of my many sins,
a preservative against all satanic working,
a riddance and hindrance of my evil conscience,
a mortification of my passions,
an appropriation of Thy commandments,
an increase of Thy divine grace ;
and a securing of Thy kingdom.

* * * * *

It is finished and done,
so far as in our power,
CHRIST our God,
the mystery of Thy dispensation.
For we have held remembrance of Thy death,
we have seen the figure of Thy resurrection,
we have been filled with Thy endless life,
we have enjoyed Thy uncloying dainties,
which graciously vouchsafe all of us
in the world to come.

LORD, the good GOD,
pardon every soul,
that purifieth his heart to seek GOD,
the LORD GOD of His fathers,
though he be not cleansed
according to the purification of the sanctuary.

THE END.

*These Tracts are continued in Numbers, and sold at the price of
2d. for each sheet, or 7s. for 50 copies.*

LONDON: PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1840.

GILBERT and RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

ON THE MYSTICISM ATTRIBUTED TO THE EARLY FATHERS OF THE CHURCH.

§ i.—*Occasion, Grounds, and Limits of the Present Inquiry.*

(1.) It is curious, and may be not uninteresting, to observe how § i. 1.
from time to time the assailants of Primitive Antiquity have shifted
their ground, since the beginning of the seventeenth century.
During the struggle of the Reformation, men had felt instinct-
ively, if they did not clearly see, that the Fathers were against
them, so far as they had begun to rationalize, whether in ecclesi-
astical practice, or in theological inquiry. But it was many years
before they ventured to avow this feeling distinctly to themselves,
much more to maintain and propagate it. It was not until divines
of his class had thoroughly wearied themselves in vain endeavours
to reconcile the three first centuries with Calvin and Zuinglius,
that Daillé published his celebrated treatise "Of the Right Use of
the Fathers¹:" in which, under pretence of impugning their suffi-
ciency as judges between Papist and Protestant, he has dexterously
insinuated every topic most likely to impair their general credit ;
professing all the while extreme respect both for their sanctity
and their wisdom ; although, perhaps, an attentive reader may
perceive his ironical meaning, disclosing itself more and more, as
his argument draws to a point. However, by his skill in rhetorical
arrangement, and by a certain air of thorough command of his
subject, which he has been very successful in assuming, he became
at once the standard author for all who took that side of the
question ; opening (if so homely a simile may be allowed) a kind

¹ In 1631.

§ 1. 1. of cheap shop, to which all who had a fancy for wares of that kind have ever since found it convenient to resort.

But though at the bottom Daillé seems to have had no more respect for Antiquity than those who came after him, he differs from them greatly, not only in his tone and manner, but also in the very ground and substance of his argument: professing, *first*, to confine himself to those points which are disputed between the Reformed and the Roman Church, (and, therefore, not to except against the Fathers' evidence on matters debated in their times, *e. g.* on the Trinitarian Controversy;) and *secondly*, laying, or seeming to lay, the chief stress of his objections on the scantiness of their remains, the amount of corruption and interpolation, the difficulty of ascertaining their real sense, and the like. When he does proceed to challenge their authority, he is careful in pointing out their own disclaimers of such authority, before he exemplifies their supposed errors and inconsistencies; which he does largely, but with great show of unwillingness, in the concluding sections of his work.

But now, if we pass over a hundred years, and come to the attacks made on the Fathers in the beginning of the eighteenth century, we shall find, for the most part, the same quotations appealed to, the same particulars insisted on, but with an air of much more open defiance, and with the direct and avowed purpose of impugning their credit, not in this or that point only, but in all questions of Christian religion. Thus Whitby prefaces his collection of what he calls specimens of patristical exposition of Scripture, with a declaration¹, that he wishes to exclude appeals to Antiquity, as to the transmission of the Rule of Faith, (meaning the great fundamental doctrines,) no less than in facts of general history, or in the controversies between England and Rome. And Middleton, in his flippant "Free Inquiry," lays the stress of his argument on his being able to prove that the ancient Fathers "were of a character from which nothing could be expected but what a weak or crafty understanding could supply, towards confirming those prejudices with which they happened to be possessed, especially where religion was the subject²."

¹ Pref. § 2. ed. 1714.

² Pref. p. xxxii.

One would think it impossible to go beyond this in the way of disparagement; but so it is, that in the course of the century which has elapsed since Whitby and Middleton, a yet more disrespectful, because more summary, way of dealing with the Fathers has become current. Whitby and Middleton did think it necessary to appear to have examined what is really to be found in Antiquity; and the former especially exhibits, throughout his treatise above-mentioned, what on his principles must be called a morbid anxiety, to confirm his own views on several important subjects, (on original sin, for example, and the natural condition of infants,) by the testimony of the very writers, whom he is most busy in disparaging. But in our day, perhaps, the more usual course is, for persons, who do not even profess any acquaintance with those writers, beyond vague impressions received from report or quotation, to dispose of their authority in any controverted point, under the notion, understood or expressed, that "the Fathers were Mystics, and need not be regarded at all."

§ i. 2.

(2.) Now, if it were indeed an object with the Evil Spirit, to decry the relics of Christian Antiquity, and divert men's attention from them, it is difficult to say what single word he could have chosen, so critically adapted to his purpose in our days, as this same word, *Mysticism*. In the first place, it is not a *hard* word, having been customarily applied to such writers as Fenelon and William Law, whom all parties have generally agreed to praise and admire. So far it suits well with the smoothness of phrase, on which the present generation especially prides itself. It seems to set down the Fathers gently, and so is readily acquiesced in by many, who would shrink from the coarse sneers of Middleton or Gibbon.

In the next place, it touches the very string, which most certainly moves contemptuous thought, in those who have imbibed the peculiar spirit of our time. *Mysticism*, implies a sort of confusion between physical and moral, visible and spiritual agency, most abhorrent to the minds of those, who pique themselves on having thoroughly clear ideas, and on their power of distinctly analysing effects into their proper causes, whether in matter or in mind.

§ i. 3. Again, Mysticism conveys the notion of something essentially and altogether remote from common sense and practical utility: but common sense and practical utility are the very idols of this age.

Further, that which is stigmatized as Mysticism, is almost always something which at once makes itself discerned by internal evidence. The man of the world, the practical man, the inductive experimental philosopher, commonly persuades himself that he can perceive by instinct, when a train of thought, or mode of speaking, is mere religious dreaming, indistinct fanciful theory; and he rejects it accordingly, and is saved all trouble of research. Here, again, is no small temptation, in the eyes of a world full of hurry and business, to acquiesce over lightly in any censure of that kind.

Yet, again, if any man be disposed to speak and think more harshly of the early Christian writers, this same term, Mysticism, may serve his purpose also; for it is easy, by a dexterous enunciation, or choice of context, to insinuate through it a charge of deliberate fraud. It is an instance, therefore, of a mode of speaking, equally convenient for all shades and degrees of enmity to, or contempt of, Antiquity. We see what its power is in a kindred instance; how meanly even respectable persons allow themselves to think of the highest sort of poetry,—that which invests all things, great and small, with the noblest of all associations,—when once they have come to annex to it the notion of Mysticism. And perhaps its mischievous effects on theology are as great as any attributable to a single word.

(3.) It may, therefore, be of some use to consider, as distinctly as we can, what people really mean when they charge the Fathers with Mysticism; which being done, we may perhaps have a better chance of making out to our satisfaction, whether, and how far, as a body, they deserve the charge.

By the term Mysticism, then, as applied to the writers in question, I understand to be denoted, a disposition, first, to regard things as supernatural which are not really such; and secondly, to press and strain what may perhaps be really supernatural in an undue and extravagant way.

(4.) Upon which bare statement, without going any further, a § 1. 4.
devout mind will probably at once acknowledge, on which side in the present question the peril of erring will be greatest. The question is like that of the general evidences of religion: a person who would go into it with advantage, should be imbued beforehand with a kind of natural piety, which will cause him to remember all along, that perhaps, when he comes to the end of his inquiry, he will find that God was all the while really there. He will "put off his shoes from off his feet," if he do but think it possible that an angel may tell him, by and by, "The place where thou standest is holy ground." So it must be, in some measure, with every right-minded person, in the examination of every practice and opinion, against which the charge of Mysticism is brought. Whatever may appear in the case at first sight, likely to move scorn or ridicule, or tempt to mere lightness of thought; it will be an exercise of faith, a trial of a serious heart, to repress for the time any tendency of that kind: the loss and error being infinitely greater, if we are found trifling with a really sacred subject, than if we merely prove to have been a little more serious than was necessary. In this sense, that is to say in regard of the reverent or irreverent *temper*, in which such inquiries may be approached, superstition is surely a great deal better than irreligion: whatever may be thought of the abstract question, Whether it be the safer extreme to believe too much, or too little?

It may be said, that the Fathers themselves indicate an exception to this rule, by the light and sarcastic way, in which they often allow themselves to treat the pretended mysteries, sometimes of heathens, sometimes of heretics as bad as heathens. But the case is not strictly in point. For I am speaking of pretensions unexamined, and therefore, as yet, more or less doubtful: but the Fathers had, or accounted themselves to have, good grounds for believing that the mysteries and miracles which they held up to scorn were, in part at least, the work of evil spirits, with whom they thus most effectually renounced communion. Before we indulge the like feeling in our treatment of any claim to supernatural powers, we had need have the like assurance of diabolical agency in them: and that to show them any reverence would seem

- § i. 5. like imparting of God's honour to the Evil One. Although even in such a case deep fear and humiliation of heart would seem the more appropriate sentiment for ordinary Christians. For is it not a fearful and humbling thought, that mankind, that we ourselves, are, or have been, in danger of mistaking the work of God's enemy for His own ?

Further, it may be well to bear in mind, that the noblest and most refined devotional tendencies have always had to bear the imputation of Mysticism, or some other equivalent word ; as if to cultivate them were a mere indulgence of a dreamy, soaring, indistinct fancy. In this use of it, the word Mysticism has done probably as much harm in checking high contemplative devotion, as the kindred term, Asceticism, in discouraging Christian self-discipline.

Thus much for the first impression, which the very application of the term to the Fathers would make on a considerate person, as yet ignorant of their writings. He would expect, almost certainly, to find them imbued with devotional feelings of an unusually high order ; and he would be prepared for the possibility, that even those views of theirs, which might seem at first glance overstrained, fantastic, or unnatural, might turn out in the end to be portions of true Christian wisdom.

(5.) What now are the particulars of the Fathers' imputed Mysticism ? *i. e.* in what respects would they be commonly charged with an undue anxiety to make out supernatural meanings and interferences ? The following heads would seem to comprehend the greater part of their supposed delinquencies in this kind :—

1. Their interpretations of Scripture are said to be far-fetched and extravagant ; extracting figurative, theological allusions out of the most irrelevant or insignificant details of language or history.

2. Correspondent to this is their mode of treating natural objects, and the truths of philosophy and common life ; fancying every where indications of that system, on which their own hearts were set.

3. They were mystics in their notions of providential interference, whether in the way of judgment, deliverance, or warning. To which head may be referred whatever they state of the exercise of the gift of prophecy in their times ; as also their

accounts of reputed miracles, and of the sensible agency of evil spirits, and of their own and others' warfare with them. § i. 6.

4. Finally, they are blamed for Mysticism, properly so called, in their moral and devotional rules; i. e. for dwelling too much on counsels of perfection, tending (as is affirmed) to contemplation rather than action, to monastic rather than social and practical virtue.

These are the sort of imputations on which the changes have been rung, for the two last centuries, by those who have wished to evade the testimony of the Fathers, without setting them down distinctly as deliberate impostors.

(6.) It may be added, that many of their professed advocates, (Warburton for example,) have in fact given up their cause, as far as concerns every one of these representations. For what, in reality, does his defence of them come to, even when he is led to state their case most favourably; e. g. in the Preface to *Julian*? Just to this, and no more: that they might be trusted in their relations of things which came within the scope of their own knowledge, provided there was no room for surmising any thing miraculous: and again, that on other subjects, whether as reasoners or as narrators, they were not weaker, but a little wiser, than Pagan and Jewish writers of the same date.

It is true that Warburton belonged to a school, which has a temptation of its own for slighting the Fathers, over and above differences in particular doctrines; a school, whose leading principle is, that theology, like other sciences, improves by time: or, (to use the words of one of its most plausible advocates) that "Christianity was in its infancy, at most in its childhood, when these men wrote; and therefore it is no wonder that they *spoke as children*, that they *understood as children*, that they *thought as children*. This was according to the economy they were then under¹."

Such writers, when they speak most modestly of themselves, and most respectfully of antiquity, do not however hesitate to make use of the old simile, of a dwarf seeing further than a giant when raised on a giant's shoulders; imagining it to be as applicable

¹ Bishop Law, as quoted by Middleton, p. 57.

§ i. 7. to religion, as it is to physical and human learning; and, when they would most appear to advocate the ancients, cannot of course refrain from stigmatizing them as inadequate judges of Christian truth, infected sometimes with Platonic, sometimes with Rabbinical error: and thus, while with a sort of candour they excuse the men at the expense of the age, they do the Adversary's work, by detracting from their authority, and withdrawing attention and deference from their writings.

But even those who in their hearts really loved to lean on Antiquity, and would have been uneasy, if they had not the suffrage of the Fathers with them, have not always taken the course most likely to win them due respect. Whether it were that they feared to commit themselves,—or that they shrunk before popular notions,—or as a mere matter of taste and feeling,—the champions of the Fathers, for many years past, have generally been content to claim credit for them only as witnesses to certain palpable facts of their time: the inevitable consequence of which has been, that even diligent and earnest inquirers have been satisfied with a second-hand knowledge of their writings; and often, when they have come in to fill their proper place in argumentative discussions, they have nevertheless been far from occupying the room which justly belonged to them, in our theological views and impressions. There are, and have been, praiseworthy attempts to raise their credit, by drawing attention to those portions of their literature, which seemed to have most in common with modern ideas, whether in the way of general reasoning with unbelievers, or of refined devotional feeling, or of eloquent morality. But the very circumstance of such selections being made with a view to modern prejudices, shows that they can do no more than palliate the evil. When a reader passes from specimens of that kind to the whole body of any Father's writings, he is apt to feel as if he had been unfairly dealt with, and is inclined rather to be the more intolerant of the many things which he is sure to meet with, alien to his former tastes and habits of thought.

(7.) May it not with reason be suspected, that the root of the matter lies deeper, and that in order to arrive at it, we must make up our minds thoroughly to consider the whole subject

ab initio? It may perhaps turn out that the boldest way of meeting the difficulty is the most rational, and ultimately the most consoling. We must not be startled, though we find ourselves compelled to own, that modern and ancient theology are to a great extent irreconcilable; that if popular notions are right, the Fathers are indeed "mystical" in a bad sense, and that, in all the several departments above mentioned.

Thus, in respect, first, of Scripture *interpretation*, the received doctrine of this age seems to be, that nothing ought to be figuratively or typically explained, except on the authority of Scripture itself¹; it being assumed, that we can no otherwise be certified of the divinely intended relation, necessary to make up the nature of a real Type. Now those who hold this rule must necessarily think meanly of the Fathers as expounders of Scripture, since in every paragraph almost we find some allegory, not scriptural according to the required test.

Secondly, in respect of *allusions* moral or theological, regularly and uniformly deduced from the contemplation of the creatures of God, in the manner, *e. g.* of Boyle's Occasional Reflections; it would probably be considered a candid judgment, in our time, which should allow that such might constitute tolerable *poetry*: but to consider them as a part of *theology*, to regard them as having been from the beginning intended by the Creator, and the creation ordered with a view to them;—who is there among us, that would not at first be tempted to reject such a theory as overstrained and merely fanciful?

Thirdly, consider the tone of thought, which is accounted as the most safe and meets with most encouragement in our days, concerning the intimations of God's mysterious *providence*, whether national or individual. Is it not a subject, that, as things are, even sincere-minded persons shrink from? They are afraid of trusting themselves with it, though but in thought. What is meant will be perceived in a moment, if people will reflect what their first impressions were, on reading, *e. g.*, the Journal of Archbishop Laud,

¹ Bp. Van Mildert, B. L. 239, sp. Horne, Introd. ii. 724; Macknight, on Paul's Ep. iv. 439.

§ 1. 8. those portions of it which detail supposed providential warnings. Or, again, how backward we all find ourselves in confessing our sense of God's judgments, public and private, when in our thoughts we can hardly fail to perceive them. I am far from asserting that this backwardness is not both pious and reasonable, taking all circumstances into account: but does it not imply a great change, either in men's condition or opinions, or in both, since the days of St. Ignatius and St. Cyprian?

Lastly, the difference in *moral sentiments* is too obvious to be denied. The cheerful, liberal, indulgent side is the popular one, now, in all questions of ethics: severity, strictness, self-denial, are but so far approved, as their immediate good effect is seen and understood. Need it be remarked, that the direct contrary is the case of the Primitive Church?

On the whole, the discrepancies between the two ages, occasioning the imputation of Mysticism to the ancients, are far beyond being accounted for by local, accidental, or temporary circumstances; they must be referred to some difference in first principles: and unless we are prepared to say positively, with the philosophic theologians above mentioned, that theology is, like other sciences, really advancing, of course, as the world grows older; we cannot but in candour allow it at least possible, before examination, that the ancients may have been in the right, and we in the wrong.

(8.) In order to judge of this fairly, one should begin by stating, with its due limitations, the real judgment of Christian Antiquity on the several matters above enumerated,—an undertaking evidently far beyond the limits of such an essay as the present: one can only endeavour to give some faint specimen of the results, which, it is conceived, more extensive inquiry would establish; premising, however, the following cautions, as necessary to be kept in view throughout the inquiry.

First, that since we are to speak of the Fathers collectively, we must be careful to select those points, in which they exhibit a tolerably general agreement. This limitation disposes at once of many of the most plausible objections to the views of Antiquity, and also of many of the unworthy and inadequate allegations of

its timid defenders ; as I hope to show hereafter in some important examples. § i. 2.

But to make the rule a practical one, we should well understand, secondly, what is to be accounted general agreement among the Fathers. For it is the third particular in the rule of Vincentius, *Quod ab omnibus*, which has ever afforded most scope for cavil to the rationalist, and for perplexity to the unwary. But let us only apply to this matter the same rules of common sense, which guide us on analogous subjects in ordinary life. A person not regularly trained in medicine desires to know what are safe rules of diet : is he to believe that there are no such rules at all, because he finds none from which, at some time or other, ingenious innovators have not contrived to dissent ? Another wishes to ascertain some point of common law : does he think it necessary for that purpose, that cases in *all points* exactly like his own shall have come under the cognisance of each former generation of jurists ? Or, in matters of navigation, would it be said there were no fixed rules, because but a few out of many seamen have left the results of their experience any where on record ? The question about the Fathers is so far like these, that it is strictly a question of *practice* : men want to know which is the *safest* way in regard of their *duty* towards God ; if they require in every point absolute inevitable demonstration, of course they cannot have it in the Fathers : but do they really think they find it in Holy Scripture ?

Certainly many of the principles most relied on by Daillé and other such writers, are such that, if we followed them out, we should not stop short of universal scepticism. *E. g.* Whitby lays it down as an axiom ¹, That if Scripture be a perfect rule of faith, it must be so clear in necessary things as to require no interpreter ; and that it cannot be a rule or measure where it is obscure. Might he not as reasonably have said, that it cannot be a rule to any one who does not thoroughly understand the languages in which it was originally written ? Such sentiments are, in fact, inconsistent with the present condition of man : they deal with us as though we might be independent of human testimony, or arrive at mathematical certainty in moral matters. We can only

¹ Pref. p. 8, 9.

12 *Agreement to be sought in Principles, not in Details :*

§ i. 8. be safe by putting them aside, and resolving to use, on this subject, the same kind of intuitive good sense, which is given us for our guide in all other matters of conduct ; which good sense, as even heathen moralists could discern, is the ordinary accompaniment and providential reward of intellectual fairness and purity.

Nor can any measure of general agreement be laid down, in words so precise, as not to leave a great deal to the exercise of this practical wisdom. However, one obvious rule would be, not to demand coincidence in detail, but in general principles ; and again, in those generals only, which belong to the professed subject-matter and scope of the writers. For example, there is hardly one of the Fathers, of whose works we have any considerable quantity remaining, but has left on record his interpretation of one part or another of the Old Testament, in sufficient quantity to indicate his rules of exposition. Now, who will deny that it would be a very remarkable fact, should those rules be found, on the whole, the same throughout the whole series of Catholic Fathers ;—a fact on which important conclusions may depend ? and yet it may so happen, that no one passage in the Bible is quoted by them all ; and again, that there are no two of them, who agree in their explanations of all the passages they quote.

Again ; it may be, that in the detail of some historical facts, or in some abstract principles not immediately bearing on theology, there may exist a general, not to say an universal, agreement, on which, nevertheless, very little can be built, because on such things they may very well be supposed to have taken for granted what was generally received in their age. Or, if they differ, such difference rather illustrates their concurrence on the great ecclesiastical subjects ; for it proves the activity of their minds, and their energy in judging for themselves, where religion permitted.

For example, among the opinions attributed to the Fathers as erroneous, we find¹ the notion of the soul in its separate state having a kind of body or sensible form, an ærial *εἶδωλον*, or vehicle (as it has sometimes been called). And again, we find cited², as a specimen of the discrepancies of Catholic writers, the opposite con-

¹ Whitby, pp. 201—3.

² Ibid. Pref. lxxvi—lxxvii.

lectures of St. Augustin and St. Jerome on the origination of the soul. Now, these are metaphysical not theological points ; they fall not within the province of Christian Antiquity as such ; on such points, neither discrepancy nor agreement in error proves any thing against the Fathers, as Divines.

(9.) As then common sense teaches, that in judging collectively of that large and miscellaneous body of literature, which goes under the name of the Fathers, we must select those points, if any, which are common to the whole mass ; and again, that when we speak of agreement among them, we must mean agreement in principle not in detail, and on Christian not on secular subjects : to a little ecclesiastical knowledge will suggest to us another consideration, very needful to be borne in mind, when we are estimating the value of their concurrence in any point within their sphere,—I mean the reverential reserve, which undoubtedly they practised in every part of religion, in proportion to its sacredness. If we would deal fairly with the subject, we must make allowance for this reserve. Knowing for certain that it did exist, we are bound to take it into the account, and often to give those who wrote under its influence credit for a more thorough agreement in high and mysterious doctrines, than their words at first sight would otherwise appear to express. One very remarkable instance, which it is enough just to mention now, it having been of late amply illustrated, is the doctrine of the Ante-Nicene Fathers concerning the Divinity of the Son of God. Another is, the rule of solemnization of the holy Sacraments. A reader, versed in liturgical language, will often discover in the writings of the Fathers, sometimes in Scripture itself, allusions to the sacraments conveyed in one word or syllable,—allusions *primâ facie* so faint, that we could hardly dare to reason upon them, were we not aware of the duty of reserve which would hinder the writers from more express disclosure of the particulars of those Holy Mysteries.

(10.) It may be well to add one more caution, relating particularly to the interpretation of Scripture. Like all questions of language, especially poetical language, it is to every one of us in some degree a matter of *taste* : we come to it prepossessed with certain conventional rules, or certain associations of our own, which

14 *Prejudices of Taste.—Universality of ancient Mysticism.*

§ ii. 1. cling by us in spite of ourselves, and often affect our reasonings more than we are aware. But as the Scripture itself, both in substance and in form, is surely far unlike what mere human wisdom would have anticipated, so it is more than possible, that the true method of interpreting it may conduct us on a very different line, from any which would be pointed out by merely human criticism. It seems reasonable, therefore, and religious, to come to questions of that kind, expecting to meet with many things, which may at first seem strange or fanciful, or otherwise unworthy of Divine wisdom ; to make up our minds beforehand, that we will not be too much startled by such things, nor reject them at once, but try them by their proper measures ; lest we be found deferring to our own prejudices, rather than to the truth of God :—prejudices, not so much of opinion, as of rhetorical or poetical taste.

Under such impressions, we may safely approach the first head of Mysticism imputed to the Fathers, *viz.* their mode of interpreting Holy Scripture.

§ ii.—*Specimen of ancient Mysticism in interpreting Scripture.*

(1.) First, as to the matter of fact ; we need not perhaps hesitate to admit in the most unreserved way,—indeed it might be hard to find any one who has ever denied,—the universal adoption, by the early Christian writers, of the allegorical way of expounding the Old Testament. They do undoubtedly profess to find an intended figurative and Christian meaning, in innumerable places, which are neither express prophecies, nor alluded to as types in the New. Not only in the prophetic writings do they find our Lord and His Gospel every where ; not only do they trace throughout the Levitical services the example and shadow of the future heavenly things ; but they deal also in the same way with the records of history, whether Patriarchal or Jewish ; and with the fragments which the HOLY GHOST has caused to be preserved out of the moral and devotional poetry of the Hebrews,—the Book of Job, the Psalms, and the Proverbs, and (what is in some respects the most significant and remarkable instance of all) the Song of Solomon from beginning to end.

The general fact is doubtless familiar to all ; being constantly

roduced, on the one hand, by the assailants of the Fathers— § II. 2, 3.
for "whole books," as Middleton contemptuously says¹, "have
been compiled of their foolish reasonings in religion;"—nor,
on the other hand, has their exercise of this mode of inter-
pretation been ever disputed, as a fact, by their defenders:
whether it has been duly appreciated by the writers of either
party, is altogether another question. Nowhere, perhaps, among
our English divines, will the subject be found treated more
thoughtfully or more worthily, than by Bishop Fell, in his notes on
St. Cyprian, and on the Apostolical Fathers. However, in so
great a consent of witnesses, one may state the case largely with-
out presumption, and without affecting more than a superficial
knowledge of Antiquity.

(2.) Let it then be taken for granted, that a mode of expound-
ing, which would seem to most men fanciful and strained, generally
prevails in the Christian writers of the first centuries. The great
point will be, to account in some measure for this fact. In order
to which it may be expedient, not by way of proof but of illus-
tration, if we take some one remarkable instance, and trace it
as we may through the writings of some of the most eminent and
earliest Fathers. And, not to give them any undue advantage,
it may be well to select one of those subjects, their treatment of
which is commonly considered most extravagant; a subject, which
has attracted towards them in no common degree the contemptu-
ous wonder of modern critics and philosophers: I mean, their
discovering the tokens of our LORD's Passion, and more espe-
cially the Sign of the Cross, in innumerable places of the Old
Testament, which neither are so expounded in the New, nor to
common eyes betray of themselves any such allusion.

(3.) To begin with the Epistle attributed to St. Barnabas; it is
well-known how unreservedly it adopts the allegorical mode of
interpretation. Supposing it not to be written by the Apostle,—a
supposition which involves no charge of forgery, since it no where
professes to be his; and in which it may not be wrong to ac-
quiesce, rather, however, for want of ecclesiastical testimony to
its genuineness, than for any thing unworthy of such an origin to
be discovered in the epistle itself,—it is undoubtedly, by the man-

¹ p. 57.

§ ii. 4. ner in which St. Clement of Alexandria quotes it, a monument of the age next after the Apostles, and almost as undoubtedly, judging by internal evidence, it was meant as what in our days would be called a popular hortatory tract, intended to reconcile the Christians of the circumcision to the utter rejection of the Jewish people. And by one expression in it¹, we may perhaps reasonably assign its date, to the year 136 or thereabouts; when Adrian, having overthrown the rebel Jews under Bar Cochab, was most active in building Ælia on the site of Jerusalem, and a Gentile Christian Church was beginning to flourish there. To this, as it may seem, the author of the Epistle applies the prophecy of Isaiah, (xlix. 17.) according to the reading of the LXX.: “‘Thou shalt be quickly builded by those who were thy destroyers:’ this,” says he, “is now in course of accomplishment. For their rising in war led to the subversion of their city by their enemies; but now the very servants of the same enemies are building it up again.”

This date deserves notice, because it suggests a sufficient reason for the freedom with which the author, in a popular tract, exhibits the method of symbolical exposition, which was generally rather withdrawn from ordinary eyes. The calamity, perhaps, was great and astounding enough to justify disclosures otherwise irregular, for the consolation and establishment of the faithful.

However, certain it is that this epistle, which is addressed to Christian men and women without distinction, might be not unfitly selected for a specimen of the mystical way, as applied to the Old Testament.

(4.) As concerning the Passion and Cross of our LORD in particular, (to say nothing of the sacrifice of Isaac, the typical nature whereof, as it seems, no age of Christians has ever denied, notwithstanding the silence of Scripture,) St. Barnabas has the following passage²: “Israel being attacked by the aliens, with a view, amongst other things, of signifying to the people, that their transgressions were the cause of their being given over to death, the SPIRIT speaks inwardly to Moses, to form a type of the Cross, and of Him who was to suffer: that if men refuse to trust in Him, they will have no peace for ever. Moses therefore places one shield on another in the middle of the mound;

¹ C. xvi.² C. xii.

and being thus posted high above all, he stretches out his hands, § ii. 12.
and so Israel began again to be victorious : afterwards, when on
the contrary he let down his hands, again they were slaughtered.
Wherefore ? That men might know there is no chance of salvation,
except they put their trust in Him. And in another Prophet he
says, 'All the day long I have stretched forth my hands to a
disobedient and gainsaying people.'"

What is very observable, the Author next goes on to mention,
with just the same tone of confidence, and no more, the typical
meaning of the Brasen Serpent ; observing, with his usual piety,
"Thou hast in this also the glory of JEsus ; that in Him, and
to Him, are all things."

Had it seemed good to God's providence, that the discourse
of our Lord to Nicodemus should have been lost, as so many
other of His divine words were, would not the Christian inter-
pretation of this latter miracle have seemed to many forced and
 fanciful, just as that of the former may perhaps seem now ?
And ought not this single consideration to stop the mouths of all,
who have any reverence in their hearts, when they find themselves
tempted to join in hasty censure or scorn of such interpretations ?
For ought they know, they may be scorning or censuring the very
lessons of our Divine Master Himself.

(12.) I proceed to another historical type, which to many may
appear more extravagant. The Author is reasoning on the history
of Abraham, to prove the insufficiency of Jewish circumcision
out of the Old Testament itself. So far, as will occur to every
one, he is treading in the steps of St. Paul. After producing
many passages to that purpose, he closes the subject with the
following¹ : "Consider whether there be not abundant instruc-
tion on this whole matter, in the account given us, that Abra-
ham, who first gave men circumcision, did thereby perform a
spiritual and typical action, looking forward to the Son : and that,
upon receiving certain doctrines conveyed in three (mystical)
matters. For He saith, Abraham circumcised of his house men
the number of three hundred and eighteen. What then is

¹ Ep. S. Barnab. c. ix.

- § ii. 13. the mysterious truth thus vouchsafed to him? Observe the eighteen first, then the three hundred. Of the two letters which stand for 18, 10 is represented by I, 8 by H. Thou hast here the word *JESUS* :” i. e., the two first letters, which formed as it were a cypher of the sacred Name, familiar to the eyes and thoughts of the Christians of that generation : as was also the third of the numeral letters in question, which the writer next goes on to explain : “ Because the Cross, which is signified to the eye by the letter Tau, was intended to bring the grace, [to which he looked forward ;] he adds the three hundred also,” the letter Tau representing that number. “ By the two first letters then the name *JESUS* is indicated, and by the third the Cross.”

On this commentary, which as well as the former has been adopted by multitudes of the early interpreters¹, several remarks occur, which it may be well to put down, as they will each of them apply to a whole class of examples, and to difficulties which are certain to arise in many of our minds, though we were never so resolutely on our guard against prejudices of mere taste and association.

(13.) First, it may be observed that the several circumstances, which may appear at first sight startling in this exposition, though not perhaps united in any one Scriptural example, have yet, each severally, undoubted sanction of Scripture. Thus, the use of the numeral letters as a cypher, to convey some mysterious truth, has a well-known precedent in the Book of Revelation. Again, the passage in St. Barnabas is an instance of the combination of texts apparently remote, but really bearing on the same subject : for the number, three hundred and eighteen, is not mentioned in the account of the circumcision of Abraham’s family, but is borrowed from the previous enumeration occasioned by the war with Chedorlaomer². Now, this sort of combination of remote texts appears to be warranted, in one in-

¹ For example, S. Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 84 ; S. Ambr. de Fide, i. init. and § 121 ; S. Aug. Quæst. in Jud. 37 ; S. Hil. de Synod. 86.

² Compare Gen. xvii. 27 ; xiv. 14.

stance at least, by our blessed LORD Himself. "Is it not written, § ii. 14.
 ' My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer ? ' " So far is taken from Isaiah, but the conclusion of the sentence, " Ye have made it a den of thieves," was addressed by Jeremiah to a subsequent generation¹.

Now whether the fact were really so or not, (if it were, it was surely by special providence,) that Abraham's household at the time of circumcision was exactly the same number as before: still the argument of St. Barnabas will stand. As thus: circumcision had from the beginning a reference to our SAVIOUR, as in other respects, so in this; that the mystical number, which is the cypher of JESUS crucified, was the number of the first circumcised household, in the strength of which Abraham prevailed against the powers of the world. So St. Clement of Alexandria², as cited by Fell³: " It is commonly supposed that we have here an indication of a correspondency between the case of Abraham's household and the method of salvation: of the victory obtained by those who have betaken themselves to the Holy Sign and Name, over those who led them captive, and the innumerable tribes of unbelievers, who follow in their train."

(14.) Nor is warrant of Scripture wanting for that which must otherwise seem most inadmissible in this interpretation; the appeal, namely, to the Greek Bible, as having something like divine authority. And this again is a topic which meets us throughout the remains both of the Greek and Latin Fathers. The Septuagint, and Latin versions clearly made from it, are everywhere unscrupulously quoted as the words of inspiration; with the single exception, perhaps, of St. Jerome. Some of the Fathers' opponents would insinuate, that this rests altogether on the tradition reported by Aristeeas, of a miraculous consent among the original translators, even in the minutest point. But this is refuted by the language of St. Augustin, who speaks doubtfully of that tradition, but without any doubt of this particular version being so overruled by a prophetic Spirit⁴, that

¹ See Isai. lvi. 7; Jer. vii. 11.

² Strom. vi. 11.

³ In loc. S. Barn.

⁴ De Doct. Christ. ii. 22.

- § ii. 14. even in those places where it swerved from the Hebrew Verity, there was a special providential design in such variation¹.

Now, can it be denied, that this idea receives countenance from the mode in which the Old Testament is quoted in the New? In the Epistle to the Hebrews, for example, St. Paul argues at large the necessity of the Mediator's death, from the use of the word *διαθήκη*, "Testament," in the LXX. to represent that Hebrew word which is commonly translated Covenant. "For this cause," says he, "it is a New Testament, of which CHRIST is said to be Mediator, that by means of death the called might receive the promise; for where a Testament is pleaded, the death of the testator must necessarily be alleged. For a Testament is valid in the case of the dead, since it never avails, as long as the testator is alive²." And he goes on to show how the word was applicable to the Mosaic covenant also, i. e. by the typical death of the sacrifices. Who does not see that this reasoning is grounded entirely on the Greek version? since the Hebrew *ברית* does not in any way answer to the notion of a last will. St. Paul's reasoning implies therefore thus much at least concerning the LXX; that in their rendering of this very critical word, they were providentially directed to the use of a term, which should convey an allusion to a great Christian mystery. And so far the Apostle warrants the judgment of St. Augustin³: "Whoever besides shall truly translate any portion of the Old Testament from Hebrew into another language:" (St. Jerome, of course, was in his mind:) "his version will be found either to agree with that of the LXX. or if it appears not to agree, in that very disagreement we must believe that there exists some deep prophetic meaning." Nay, even St. Jerome, when he is impugning their authority, seems to own that there might exist in them a modified and inferior kind of inspiration. "I do⁴ not condemn, I do not blame the LXX. but I confidently prefer the Apostles to them all. Christ speaks to me by the lips of those, concerning whom I read⁵, that they stand even before

¹ De Civ. Dei, xviii. 43.

² Heb. ix. 15—20.

³ S. Aug. ubi sup.

⁴ Prolog. in Gen. t. ix. p. 10. Ed. Vallars. Venet. 1770.

⁵ 1 Cor. xii. 28.

Prophets in the order of spiritual gifts ; in which order the interpretation of tongues occupies nearly the last place." § II. 15.

We have seen that in one place at least this view is justified by the Scripture : and one place is sufficient for our present purpose, which is, not to prove the LXX. infallible, but to bespeak a certain reverence for their yet unexamined decisions, and for the constant appeals of the early writers to them. For who can assure himself, that in any variation from the Hebrew, which seems to him most unaccountable, they were not guided by the same influence, which caused them to write Testament instead of Covenant, in the places referred to by St. Paul ?

(15.) To return to the passage in Genesis : in whatever measure the fact is made out, that the received Greek version of the Scriptures was under a peculiar providence, in the same degree it is rendered not improbable, that even in such an apparently casual thing as the number of Abraham's servants, there was an eye to the benefit and consolation which the Church should long after receive, on recognising, as it were, her Saviour's cypher, in the account of the one holy family triumphantly warring against the powers of the world. It were a most inadequate judgment, to estimate that consolation by any of the feelings and opinions current in our time. We must go back to the days when Christians were used to carry about with them every where the Sign of the Cross ; when, to use the forcible words of Tertullian¹, " At every step and every movement, going out and coming in, dressing and putting on their sandals, at the bath, at the board, when lamps were lighted, when they lay down to rest, when they seated themselves for their daily task, whatever call of ordinary life engaged them, the Holy Sign, by incessant use, was as it were worn into their foreheads." With such associations, it must have been a real joy to them, as often as they discovered the Cross in the Old Testament, where they had not marked it before : it was to them an outward and visible sign of their communion with Saints and Patriarchs of old, and of God's everlasting providence over both. It was moreover a perma-

¹ De Cor. Mil. c. 3.

§ ii. 16, 17. nent warning, intelligible to all, against the impiety, not unusual in those days, of ascribing the two Testaments to different deities. People little know what they do, when they deal contemptuously with any thing, be it in Scripture or in common life, under the notion that it is too slight, too insignificant, for the ordering of the Most High.

(16.) All which considered, there appears no fanaticism, but a great deal of sober piety and charity, in the expressions of St. Barnabas on dismissing this topic. "He knows" the reality of this mystery "from whom we," Christians or Christian teachers, "derive the ingrafted gift of that teaching, which is properly His. Never have I delivered to any one a more genuine exposition, but I am well assured that you are meet to receive it."

If the writer had been merely indulging his own fancy, this profession of reserve would be mere affectation. But surely, to esteem it such is too hard a supposition, considering the perfect simplicity and moral purity of the precepts at the close of the Epistle. His very tone and manner, then, creates an additional presumption, that the exposition which he had been giving was not private but ecclesiastical, and the sort of scruple, with which he imparts it, an instance of that discipline of reserve, which the Church recommended in the conveyance of all her mysteries.

(17.) Neither need any one be staggered at the idea, which his manner of speaking at first sight appears to imply, that Abraham himself was not ignorant of this mystery; a notion upon which Dr. Whitby has built what he conceives to be a triumphant refutation of the allegory. "The Hebrew letter Tau¹," he observes, "neither bears the form of the Cross², nor is the symbol of the number three hundred; and as to the Greek letters, they were not invented till long after Abraham's time." Well; but does St. Barnabas affirm that Abraham himself knew the meaning of this Greek cypher? If he did, he might suppose it made known by prophetic inspiration; according to the received exposition of the text in St. John, "Your father Abraham

¹ De S. S. Interp. p. 9. ² See S. Jerome on Ezek. ix. 4. t. v. pars i. p. 95, 6.

rejoiced to see my day." But what are St. Barnabas' own words? "He circumcised his family, λαβὼν τριῶν γραμμάτων δόγματα, after he had received the doctrines of the three letters," i. e. certain mysterious truths, of which the three letters were to be a symbol. It is not said, he received them by the three letters.

§ ii. 18.

Again, after stating the number of the household, he asks, τίς οὖν ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ γνῶσις; which may be perhaps best construed, "What is the evangelical meaning of the signs given to him?" taking γνῶσις *objectively*, for the truth sealed up, not *subjectively*, for the impression on Abraham's mind. It is not therefore necessary to understand St. Barnabas as asserting, that the holy Patriarch himself had this secret revealed to him. For any thing he affirms, it might be a γνῶσις, the outward cypher of which only was given to Abraham, the key reserved for the times of our Lord and His Gospel.

And after all, a mistake in that particular could not fairly invalidate the whole interpretation. There is a school of theologians, which maintains that Abel must have known the full doctrine of the Atonement. Those who hesitate in allowing this, do not therefore necessarily doubt the typical and mystical import of Abel's history. So in this case, we might believe St. Barnabas, stating what was known in his time to be the signification of the three letters, while we demurred to his supposition, that it was known also to Abraham.

(18.) There is yet one more instance, in this ancient epistle, of allegorical interpretation with reference to the Cross of our Lord: an instance which like the former may stand at the head of a class, and being well considered, may throw much light on another wide province of the so called mysticism of the Church. "Let us see," says the writer¹, "whether the Lord has seen good to give men prophetic indications of the Water and of the Cross." Then, after other texts, he alleges the first Psalm, "He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of waters, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper. The ungodly

¹ 8. Barnab. Ep. c. xi.

§ ii. 19. are not so : but are like the chaff which the wind driveth away ; therefore the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous. For the LORD knoweth the way of the righteous : but the way of the ungodly shall perish." Then, "Observe," says he, "how distinctly the prophet has pointed out the tree and the water in combination. For what he says, comes to this : 'Blessed are they who, setting their hope in the cross, have descended into the water : for I will render their reward in its time,' i. e. hereafter. But for the present, the Psalmist adds, 'his leaf shall not wither,' i. e. every word which shall go out of your mouth in faith and love, shall be to the conversion and hope of many." The allusion to the Cross is here brief and obscure, turning as it does upon the single word *τὸ ξύλον*. But the moral of the passage is surely most noble and beautiful. "The Cross, applied by Holy Baptism, gaining the victory over the powers of the world, is not only the pledge and mean, but also the emblem, of the faithful man's triumph over his spiritual enemies. It is the pattern, as its LORD is the giver, of all victory. And therefore, blessed is the man who walks strictly according to all the rules of a holy life : for he is like the Cross of CHRIST ; his success is sure, his lot, to bear fruit eternally without stint or measure."

Every one must admire the thought, but the question now is, how it is derived from the Psalm. The account of which, and of many like texts, seems to be as follows : The old Christian writers, either by tradition, or by a feeling so general that it seemed almost like a natural instinct, believed that the phrase *τὸ ξύλον*, wherever introduced in the Old Testament, was intended to lead their thoughts to the cross ; of which in their ordinary speech, *τὸ ξύλον* was perhaps the most frequent appellation. Accordingly, not only such obvious analogies as Isaac bearing the wood of his sacrifice, the Brasen Serpent, or such a place as that in Isaiah, "The government," i. e. the sign of power, the victorious Cross, "shall be upon his shoulder,"—but every rod also, or staff, or sceptre, mentioned by either of the sacred writers, as it was a token of guidance, support, or dominion, was, in the Fathers' judgment, a designed emblem of the Cross.

(19.) The best way, perhaps, of exemplifying this, will be to tran-

tribe from Justin Martyr's dialogue with Tryphon, which may be considered as a popular view of the *prima facie* evidence for Christianity in the Old Testament, the remarkable passage¹ in which he undertakes to prove, that "since the time of our Lord's crucifixion, there hath been inseparably associated with Him that which is an emblem, on the one hand, of the tree of life, the plantation of which in Paradise had been matter of early revelation; on the other hand, it is also an emblem of the course appointed by the Almighty for the righteous." This passage, then, professedly gives the view, which the Christians of Justin's time took of large portions of the ancient Scriptures: and it is noticeable also on another account, that it has attracted the special scorn of rationalist writers: the language, for example, of Middleton concerning it, is marked (I had almost said) by *brutal* reverence². However, thus Justin proceeds:

"Moses with a rod was sent to redeem the people; and bearing this in his hand, in the place of sovereignty over them, he divided the Red Sea. It was by this that the rock gave forth water, gushing out in his sight. It was a tree which he cast into the waters of Marah, which being bitter were so made sweet. It was by means of rods cast into the water, that Jacob caused the sheep of his mother's brother so to conceive, that the young might fall to his share. With his rod, or staff, he, the same Jacob, passed over the water of Jordan] as he himself boasts. He declared that a ladder had been seen by him, and that it was God Himself who was stationed on the top thereof, the Scripture hath expressly affirmed." This example is not irrelevant, since a ladder is part (so to speak) of the furniture of the Cross. Then having discussed on some other emblems occurring in the vision at Bethel, Justin goes on: "It was the rod of Aaron, which by its budding declared him High Priest. That as a rod from the root of Jesse Christ should be born, Isaiah foretold; and David saith that the righteous man is as the tree planted by the river of waters, which shall bring forth his fruit in its season, and his leaf shall not wither:" where we have Justin's sanction for the interpretation

¹ Opp. p. 312—314. ² Free Inquiry, &c. p. 29.

- § ii. 20. which St. Barnabas had given before him. "Again, he saith, 'The righteous shall flourish like a palm.' From a tree God appeared to Abraham, as it is written, at the oak of Mamre. Seventy willows and twelve fountains the people found, having passed over Jordan. By a rod and a staff, David affirms that he received comfort from his God. It was wood which Elisha cast into the river Jordan, and so brought up the iron of the axe, wherewith the sons of the prophets had gone forth, to cut timber for building that mansion, wherein it was their purpose to recite and study the law and the commandments of God. Even as when we were plunged deep in the most grievous sins, which had been our practice, by His Crucifixion on the tree, and by the water of His Purification, our CHRIST redeemed us, and caused us to become an house of prayer and adoration [to Himself]. Also, it was a rod which manifested Judah to be the father of those [twins] who were so born of Tamar, as to exhibit a great mystery."

(20.) From this enumeration, which contains in brief the substance of a great body of commentaries, the chain of ideas is at once apparent, which led to the mystical exposition of the first Psalm. As in the former instances, the uplifted arm of Moses, and the cypher inclosed in the number of Abraham's household, it was the *form* of the Cross which conveyed the divine intimation : so here the *material* of the Cross is found indued with the like emblematical virtues.

Again, as St. Barnabas had produced this Psalm as shadowing out a mystic combination of the Cross and the Water, and therefore representing the condition of Christian people ; so in almost all the anecdotes, parables, and allusions, collected by Justin in this passage, the like combination is observable. Thus, to take the history of Moses, the virtue of his rod was shown at the *Red Sea*, and in bringing *water* out of the rock ; the *water* of Marah was sweetened by the tree which he cast in : the trees and fountains of Elim *seen together*, were the earnest of hope to the Israelites at their entrance on the wilderness. Elisha's causing iron to swim was a token, as we have seen, of our deliverance "by the crucifixion on the tree, and the water of purification."

It will be at once seen what a strong light is thrown, by such a series of examples, on the doctrine of the Sacraments, as held by that generation. The Cross and the Water, it is taken for granted, go together to save a man. § ii. 21.

(21.) But in order to appreciate rightly the Fathers' reasoning in such places, we ought of course to recollect, that its force lies in the accumulation of instances. It is not necessary that each anecdote, taken by itself, should be a complete type of the evangelical truth, at which the sum of the whole points : *e. g.* though a person questioned the distinct allusion to any Christian mystery, the account, taken singly, of Jacob's using rods to influence the breed of Laban's cattle, still it must come in as one among many examples, to show how constantly the ALMIGHTY employed that material, which was to be the instrument of redemption, as a conveyance of temporal blessings to His chosen people.

Nor must we omit the scriptural sanction, which may seem to be vouchsafed to this whole class of symbols, by the mention in the New Testament of the ark of Noah : on which Justin himself comments elsewhere in the following way¹. "In Isaiah it is said by the ALMIGHTY to Jerusalem, I saved thee in the deluge of Noah." He seems to be quoting, not in words but in sense, that portion of the 54th chapter, "As I have sworn that the waters of Noah shall no more overflow the earth, so have I sworn to be wroth with thee no more.") "Now," proceeds Justin, "this is the declaration of God, that the mystery of those who were saved by CHRIST was exhibited at the deluge. For the righteous Noah, with the rest at the deluge, . . . being eight in number, had a token of that eighth day, on which our Lord CHRIST showed Himself risen from the dead : the eighth day numerically, but virtually the first, from the beginning. For CHRIST, as He was the first-born of every creature, so He became anew the beginning of a new race of men ; *viz.* that which was regenerated by Him, through Water and Faith ; and also, we may add, by Wood, since Wood expresses the mystery of the Cross. Even as Noah also was preserved by wood, floating upon the waters with those who

¹ P. 367, c.

§ ii. 22, 23. belonged to him. When therefore the prophet says, 'I saved thee in Noah,' he is speaking to that people, who, like Noah, are faithful to God, and have the same tokens from Him that Noah had."

Thus far St. Justin the Martyr, shewing how, in the history of the ark, there was a designed allusion to the Cross; and by parity of reasoning justifying the like exposition, wherever it has seemed good to ALMIGHTY GOD to use the material of the Cross, namely wood, in the machinery, so to call it, of His miraculous providence, over those who, in their several ages, were to prepare the way of His CHRIST.

(22.) For this may be observed of all the instances, enumerated above from Jewish or Patriarchal history, (and I remark it on account of those especially, who may be inclined to treat the subject lightly) that, one and all, they are discernible links in the providential chain above mentioned; they all relate to critical moments in the history of the chosen seed. Thus, the supernatural increase of Jacob's flock, by means of the rods, was the first great step towards the increase of the chosen family into a nation: and again, Judah's staff, the producing of which as his token, stayed the sentence of death against Tamar, was thereby instrumental in preserving the life of her infant, in whom it was God's purpose to continue the chosen seed.

Perceiving, as we do in these cases, something of God's design in interfering, it surely becomes us to treat those traditions with reverence, which teach that in the *manner* of interfering He had respect continually to the end of the whole dispensation, i. e. to the Cross of His Son. And if we find other instances alleged, whose place in the divine œconomy we are as yet unable to make out, let us not rashly treat them as trifling or fanciful. If we do not see their force at first, if they appear to us quaint and overstrained, it is surely *possible* that this our ignorance may be our own fault or our own trial; it is no *absolute* proof that the old interpreters are wrong.

(23.) In quitting for the present this subject, of the types of the Cross in the Old Testament, I would just remark further, that it furnishes a clear and instructive example of the manner in which

The Fathers passed from one branch of mysticism into another ; § ii. 24.
from allegorizing the word of God, to spiritualizing His works.
We have seen how they found, or thought they found, a designed
remembrancer and token of the Cross, wherever either its mate-
rial or its form occurred in the Old Testament : and full as their
minds evidently were of the Scriptures, it was but one step farther,
to carry the same association with them, which way soever they
turned, in common life, or among natural objects. For example,
no ordinary a sight as that of a flourishing tree by a river side
could hardly fail to excite in a devout mind, thoroughly familiar
with the Psalms, the remembrance of the description above
quoted, with which that divine book opens ; which description
again, as we have seen, was in a primitive Christian's mind in-
comparable from thoughts of the Cross and of the Font.

Here then, among God's visible ordinary works, we obtain a
standing type or symbol, and,—bearing as it does the mark of
election by the HOLY GHOST, may we not venture to call it a
pledge,—of His great invisible work in Holy Baptism ; the grace
of which, we are thus taught, diffusing a kind of insensible virtue
through the whole of our renewed nature, causes a man to grow
into the likeness of CHRIST, to partake more and more of His Cross,
and so to have surer and surer hope, that “ look, whatsoever he
saith, it shall prosper” for ever.

By this and other like instances, a window being once opened
for the lamps lighted within the Church to stream here and there
upon the external world, it was rendered easy for a devout and
contemplative mind to invent and pursue like trains of thought,
and other instances, less expressly warranted in Scripture.

(24.) To take an instance from the subject which has now em-
ployed us : the early Christian writers repeatedly point out, in
nature and in common life, what they regard as designed provi-
dential intimations of the doctrine of redemption, or some part of
it, by association either with the form or with the material of the
Cross. This they do, not only in flights of devotional poetry, or in
what might be considered the indulgence of a meditative imagina-
tion, but in serious argument even with unbelievers. So in Justin's
well-known appeal, where he is asserting the dignity of the

§ ii. 24. Cross¹. "Providentially," he says, "it was so ordered, that in no instance, in the legend of any of those who were called sons of Jupiter, did the Evil Spirits enact the death of the Cross. For it was not understood by them, all the prophecies of it being symbolically expressed. Now the Cross, as one of the Prophets (Habakkuk) foretold, is the most potent symbol of His power and sovereignty; as appears even from things daily before our eyes.

"For consider all the affairs of the world: is there any, in the ordering and due combination whereof, this form does not occur? There is no crossing the sea, except this triumphant sign, which, in that instance, is formed by what they call the yard-arm, remain entire in the vessel: neither without it is there any plowing the land: neither those who dig in the ground, nor those who work in handicrafts, can perform their task, but by tools having this form: nay, and the human figure differs from animals without reason in nothing so much as in being erect, and in admitting extension of the hands each way:" (which association, we may remark by the way, Holy Scripture itself might suggest, by the posture of Moses ensuring the defeat of Amalek). But to proceed with Justin: "The human countenance," he adds, "bears this also as a mark of distinction from brutes, that from the forehead the line of the nose is drawn out with a sort of prominence; so that where the breath of life is drawn, there the lines exhibit no other figure than that of the Cross: which the Prophet also hath thus expressed²: 'The very breathing of our nostrils, is *CHRIST* the LORD.' Moreover your ensigns also," (he is speaking to the Cæsars) "express majesty by this form, wherewith you every where solemnize your processions; in them exhibiting the signs of your sovereignty and power. It is so, though it be unconsciously done on your part. When your emperors die, their images in this form are dedicated by you; and in writing thereon, you style them gods."

"Thus," he concludes, "having urged you to the best of our power, both by reasoning, and by this appeal to a visible form, which is continually meeting your eyes, we consider

¹ 2 Apol. p. 90. B.

² Lamentations iv. 20.

ourselves to have done our part, and not to be responsible, should § II. 25.
you remain unbelievers."

(25.) One would have supposed, that at least the piety and good meaning of such trains of thought might remain unquestioned, by all believers in the Cross of CHRIST, whatever judgment might be formed on their logical accuracy. Yet, so it is, that on passages of this kind a charge has been grounded against the Fathers, of directing the "faith of their readers to the efficacy of the figure of the Cross, rather than to the Atonement made thereon." A charge which might perhaps be tenable, could it be proved that the general views and conduct of the same Fathers were such as to contradict their truly believing the Atonement. Just as, if there were any persons, either in ancient or in modern times, who observed no rules of self-denial, we might conclude at once that any trust they had, or taught others to have, in "CHRIST crucified," was in fact a trust in a certain form of words, not in the virtue itself of that blessed sacrifice. What was the Cross, as employed by the Fathers, but a "Verbum visibile," recalling to the minds of the baptized the very truth which they are thus accused of slighting; and to the heathen themselves conveying so much as this, that the Gospel was essentially a doctrine of the Cross, a doctrine of suffering in adherence to a crucified Redeemer? As an expressive symbol, therefore, or word, the Sign of the Cross was liable to the same abuse with words in general: the self-deceit of man might enable him sometimes to acquiesce in the sign without the thing signified; and such a caution might be occasionally needed, as Wesley is reported to have received from William Law: "Remember that a man may deceive himself as easily by the phrase, 'justification by faith,' as by any other combination of syllables."

But supposing no such practical proof against them, may we not say, that the Fathers' veneration for the Cross is *primâ facie* as much a proof of their receiving the doctrine of CHRIST crucified, as any form of words in which they could possibly have expressed themselves? And there was this plain and material reason, for their preferring the visible symbol to any mode of speech, in treatises for general reading; that they did not thereby convey more knowledge, than the rule of the Church allowed, to those who were without, while to every baptized believer they conveyed

§ ii. 26. intimations, deep and solemn in proportion to the depth of his faith.

(26.) But not only with the figure of the Cross, but with its material also, the piety of those times associated divine relations and recollections; transferring, by an easy process, the mystical allusion, which the New Testament expressly sanctioned in the case of the ark, not only, as before mentioned, to other scriptural facts, such as that of Elisha causing the iron to swim, but also to occasions of common life; such, for example, as that mentioned by St. Cyprian, where he comforts certain imprisoned confessors, with thoughts, which to the world may seem merely enthusiastic and fanciful; but let not us rashly apply such words to the reflections of holy men, suffering for the truth's sake, on the circumstances of their trial; circumstances which others might term casual, but which they feel to be providential. Thus, I say, St. Cyprian writes, to Nemesianus and other confessors, condemned to the mines¹.

"The circumstance of your having been first beaten with staves, and by severe pain of that kind begun to solemnize the first glorious stage of your confession, has nothing in it that we need abhor, or earnestly deprecate. For those limbs of yours, christened as they were, and having all their hope in the Wood of the Cross, shrank not for terror from the wood of the persecutors' staves. The sacrament and token of his salvation was recognised by the servant of CHRIST. Redeemed before by wood to eternal life, by wood in another form he now finds himself borne onwards to his crown."

This passage may serve as a specimen of the manner, in which those first Christian moralists improved things, seemingly trivial, to spiritual associations. Those who merely make light of such allusions, know little of the real comfort they are calculated to give, to minds over depressed, perhaps, by sickness or privation. And may we not also say, they know but little, I fear we all know far less than we ought, of that serious and thankful frame of mind, which fears to accept such consolations, without owning a special Providence in them, and regarding

¹ Ep. 86. ed. Fell, p. 231.

them as real tokens of the greater blessing, with which they are associated ? § II. 27.

So far we have traced the chief mystical expositions, relating to the Passion of our LORD, in the epistle of St. Barnabas ; and we seem to perceive that they are but so many specimens (so to call them) of as many groupes of allusions, constantly occurring in the remains of the early Church.

(27.) There is yet one other aspect, in which the Wood or Tree of the Cross was contemplated by the Church of the first ages, viz. as bearing a designed reference to the fatal wood, or tree of knowledge in Paradise. This is put plainly and forcibly by St. Irenæus, (v. 17,) in a passage which it may be well to quote at length, as containing perhaps the best illustration that can be given of this whole subject. He is demonstrating the harmony of the Old and New Testaments, as different parts of the one great scheme of salvation. And having first pointed to the light thrown by the Incarnation of the WORD on the statement, that man was created after God's image, he proceeds to argue on the Passion in the following way :

“ Not only thus did the LORD manifest both the Father and Himself, but also by His very Passion. For doing away with that disobedience of mankind, which from the beginning had taken place through the wood, or tree of knowledge, He became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross.” The rebellion, I say, which the one tree had occasioned, He heals by that submission, which was wrought in the other. Whereas, had He been announcing another Father, He could not, by this sameness of subject, have indicated His coming to do away with the disobedience which had been committed against our CREATOR. But inasmuch as the very same things, which occasioned our refusal to hear and obey God's word, were the instruments whereby He introduced obedience and entire conformity to His word, He openly shows Himself hereby to be that God, whom in the first Adam we offended, not performing His commandment ; but in the second Adam we are reconciled to the same, having become obedient unto death. For to no other were we

§ ii. 28. debtors, but to Him, whose commandment also we transgressed from the beginning." And presently after, "He hath blotted out the handwriting of our debt, and fixed it to His cross, that as by the tree we were made debtors to God, so by the tree we might receive remission of our debt. This hath been shown in symbol through many, but more especially through the prophet Elisha." Then after relating the miracle as above quoted by Justin Martyr, Irenæus proceeds, "Thus by action the prophet showed, that the solid" (which word seems to mean "enduring, irresistible") "WORD of God, which we through negligence had lost and could not find, we shall recover through the dispensation of the Tree or Wood. For that the axe is in some way a figure of the WORD of God, St. John the Baptist shows, speaking of Him: 'Now also is the axe laid to the root of the trees.' And Jeremiah in like manner says, 'The WORD of the LORD is an axe cleaving a rock'.¹ Him, then, before hidden from us, the dispensation of the Tree or Wood hath now manifested. For since by the tree we lost Him, by the tree again He hath become evident unto all; shewing in Himself the length, and height, and depth, and breadth; and as one of our elders said, by the divine extension of His Hands, gathering the two peoples unto one God. For the Hands are two, because there are also two peoples, scattered to the ends of the earth; but the Head in the midst is one, because there is one God, who is over all, and through all, and in us all."

(28.) In the other Apostolic Fathers, I do not know that more than one instance occurs of the mystical mode of interpretation; but nothing is to be concluded from this omission, inasmuch as we seldom or never find either Hermas, Ignatius, or Polycarp, quoting the Old Testament at all. St. Hermas indeed hardly quotes the New, perhaps because the parabolical air of his treatise was better preserved by avoiding such definite allusions; or because (which seems not improbable) the sacred Books, many of them, had not yet come into his hands. And of the other two venerable Saints, it may be observed in general, that

¹ C. xxiii. 29.

in no part of their writings had they occasion to enter into § ii. 28.
debate, either with Jews or with impugnors of the Old Testament; which two controversies generally called forth the mystical principle of interpretation in the subsequent age.

But in the epistle of St. Clement there is a well-known passage, which proves that by him, at least, that mode of exposition was neither unknown nor disapproved. Having related the history of the harlot Rahab, as an argument of God's blessing on faith as shown by hospitality, he proceeds¹: "They went on to give her a sign, viz. that she should hang a scarlet thread from her house; foretoking this, that by the blood of the Lord shall be redemption to all who believe and hope in God. Behold, my beloved: not only faith, but prophecy was in this woman." As if he had said, "It was not a simple case of an individual sinner of the Gentiles preserved by faith; but God so highly favoured her, as to make her person and history a prophecy by action, of the salvation which should be by the Cross."

Now this single instance, well considered, appears to bring the question of the mystical interpretation, as it were, to a point. Here is a writer (one is more than half afraid to speak in such a tone of one who came so very near the Apostles, but, if we must so speak of him, here is a writer) of the very highest human claims; the chosen, ordained friend of St. Paul and St. Peter; a person of the greatest practical good sense, as every part of his epistle shows; full of deep piety, and reverence for the holy Scriptures of God; of a flowing style, and abundant in resources both of imagery and of language, so that he was not under the temptation, which an ordinary writer might feel, of inserting such topics as happened to present themselves, whether satisfied with them himself or no: moreover, he was evidently not carried away by a passion for allegorical interpretation as such, as is proved by the fact that this of Rahab is the solitary instance in which he employs it. Now, can we believe that such a person, so circumstanced, writing in the most solemn way on the most sacred of all subjects, and on an occasion which must have recalled most forcibly the memory of St. Paul, his father in the

¹ 1 Ep. ad Cor. c. xii.

§ ii. 28. faith, not long since dead :—can we believe that he could have delivered such an exposition, and applied to it the sacred name of Prophecy, publicly and authoritatively, speaking as he did for the Church, and not for himself only :—had he not been *sure* that he was uttering the mind of the HOLY GHOST ? I much fear that we do but betray our own comparative irreverence and indifference towards God's holy and awful truth, when we are forward to suspect His favoured and accredited servants of such light extemporal dealing with His word. Surely the less violent supposition is, that St. Clement knew what he was saying, when he thus taught or rather reminded the Church (for he speaks not as conveying a new truth, but rather as exemplifying one already acknowledged) that the colour of scarlet, providentially employed as a token and means of deliverance, was an earnest of the Atoning Blood, to be sprinkled, like that of the Paschal Lamb, over the door-ways of those who should be heirs of salvation. Whereby he has also confirmed the analogous interpretation of those places, where *scarlet* is enjoined as the colour to be used in sprinkling and other legal purgations ; and has sanctioned the notion of the many subsequent writers, by whom that colour, whether found in Scripture or in nature, is constantly regarded as *οἰκεῖον* (to speak rhetorically) to the Passion of our LORD : as much intended among colours to symbolize His Blood, as the shape of the Cross among forms, or its material, wood, among substances.

Whatever warrant he had for saying what he has said of the call of Rahab, the same, or like it, Tertullian (*e. g.*) may have had, for referring the text in Isaiah¹,—"Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow : though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool ;"—to the different degrees of guilt incurred by the Jews, first as murderers of the prophets, afterwards as crucifiers of our LORD. "The word crimson," says he, "denotes the blood of the Prophets ; scarlet, that of the LORD, as excelling in lustre." Irenæus again, mixing up his commentary with thoughts yet more awful² ; "Rahab the harlot, condemning herself as a heathen guilty of all kinds of

¹ l. 18.² iv. 37.

sin, received and hid within her home" (he does not say *two*, but *three* spies or watchers) "the Three Explorers who were exploring the whole earth, the FATHER namely, and the SON, with the HOLY GHOST." Which words are not to be so understood, as if Irenæus were affirming the Three Divine Persons to have then revealed themselves visibly and personally; since it is a material part of the main argument of his work, to show that all visible manifestations of the ETERNAL FATHER, in the times of the Old Testament, were made through the only-begotten SON: but he means, apparently, that Rahab and those like her, receiving those who come in God's Name, do in fact receive HIM. He goes on with the history of Rahab; "When the whole city where she dwelt had fallen into ruin at the sound of the seven trumpets, in that extremity Rahab the harlot was preserved with her whole house, by the faith implied in that sign of the scarlet thread: even as the LORD declared to those who would not receive His Advent, to the Pharisees, and such as make light of the sign of the scarlet robe, which was also a token of the Passover, the redemption and withdrawing of the people from Egypt,—to the despisers thereof, I say, the LORD declared, 'The publicans and harlots take place of you in the kingdom of heaven.'" And Justin, in like manner; adding a remark, that the messengers were sent by Him who bore the Name of JESUS¹; "The symbol of the scarlet line denoted the token of CHRIST'S Blood, whereby men of all nations, formerly impure and unjust, are saved, receiving remission of sins, and sinning no more."

On this whole history we may remark, as on that of Jacob before, that it bears on a critical point in the progress of the great dispensation, and on the continuation of the sacred line in which CHRIST was to be born. Also, that each of the successive writers (and the chain might be continued much further) notices, not ambitiously but naturally, some circumstance unobserved by his predecessors; so that the whole, taken together, forms an allegory much more complete and striking, than we find in either of the statements taken singly. Dare any man deny, that these are great marks of Truth, even according to our modern measures, incompetent as they obviously are to these investigations?

¹ Dial. cum Tryph. p. 338. D.; Ed. Paris 1636.

§ iii. 1. (29.) We have thus endeavoured to trace one set of mystical allusions, those, namely, which are drawn from the circumstances of our LORD's Passion, through the interpretations of the Old Testament, left us by the Apostolic Fathers; and also to illustrate them from the Fathers of the next generation, so far as to give some idea of the kind of consent, in their mode of expounding, which is found among them all: an agreement not in minute particulars, as if they borrowed from one another, nor yet as if they were bound down in common by any strict ritual, or hieroglyphical alphabet; but rather in a way which cannot, perhaps, be better expressed, than in the words of St. Augustin¹, where he lays down the principle which guided him in the investigation of historical types. "These secrets of Divine Scripture we trace out as we may, one more or less aptly than another, but as becomes faithful men, holding thus much for certain; that not without some kind of foreshadowing of future events, were these things done and recorded; and that to CHRIST only, and His Church, the City of God, are they to be referred in every instance," so far as they are figurative.

On the true cause of this very general agreement, some considerations will be offered hereafter, which may at least have the effect of helping us all to think with seriousness of heart, on a subject, which scholars in general have, perhaps, been apt to treat over-lightly, not to say profanely; so that, in speaking of it, a person insensibly falls into the apologetic tone. But the more we really come to know and think of it, the more deeply, perhaps, shall we feel, that even that tone is inexcusable presumption, compared with what would become us, in making mention of those who come nearest the Apostles, and had in greatest perfection the mind of CHRIST.

§ iii.—*The Literal Sense left entire by the Mysticism of the Church.*

No impression, I believe, is more general among ordinary readers of theology, than this; that beyond a strong tendency to allegory, the Fathers had no definite principles at all, by which to

¹ De Civ. Dei, xvi. 2.

interpret Scripture, but only employed, in a rhetorical way, whatever allusions best served the purpose of the moment. A remarkable and not a very encouraging fact, if such really were the case, that such a series of distinguished writers,—writers whom their very censurers¹ allow to have greatly exceeded the mass of their contemporaries,—zealously applying themselves to this one work, and with a devotion and reverence as sincere, in very many cases, as martyrdom could prove it;—that these should have gone on quite at random, and have been right, when they were right, only by a happy chance. Nor would it seem easy to reconcile such a statement with our Lord's command to search the Scriptures, and with His implied and express promises of spiritual aid; unless we were prepared to maintain, what all history contradicts, that the Fathers either neglected the Bible, or forfeited the promise of aid in the study of it by gross heresy, or insincerity, proved by ill conduct.

But is the fact so, that they were without principles of interpretation? Is it not rather our want of steady attention and reverential industry in examining the whole subject, which makes it seem so to us? It is readily allowed that there exists a peculiar difficulty, in evolving the patristical rules for expounding Scripture, on which difficulty something will be presently said. But that some such principles, however latent, do exist, we might confidently gather from this one fact; that no one, tolerably versed in their writings, would fail to detect their style of interpretation, wherever he met with it, by something in its air and tone; something not the less real, because it may be to us indescribable in words. Let any one, for example, compare the commentary of Quesnel on the New Testament, or that of Wogan on the Proper Lessons, both which are expressly founded on the ancient glosses, with the explanations of Scripture interspersed in the "Pilgrim's Progress." Both being to a high degree allegorical, he will yet find the one throughout of a different caste and family from the other.

(2.) Now it is no wonder if we find it difficult to seize indistinct thought, and embody in language, the exegetic principles of the

¹ See Warburton, *Int. to Julian, Works*, iv. 340, 341. Ed. 1788.

§ iii. 3. old Church writers, since, in all probability, few, if any, of them were ever able to do so for themselves. With an instinctive skill, acquired, in part at least, by long and zealous training of themselves in that one department, they *felt* when any exposition or conjecture, which occurred to them, was (to use their own word) Ecclesiastical, and when otherwise. It was a happy sagacity, which could afford to dispense with all manner of critical and argumentative development. They were natives, and could speak the language idiomatically, without stopping to recollect rules of grammar.

And here we seem to have no inconsiderable proof, that the mystical interpretation was no result of a theory subsequently introduced among Christians; it was not this or that writer's importation or invention, but it was from the beginning habitually inwrought into the thoughts and language of the Catholic Church.

Hereby also we have suggested to us a way for attaining to a virtual knowledge of their rules of interpretation, though we perhaps may never be able, any more than they were, to trace out those rules in language. We have only to exercise ourselves much and deeply in their expositions of Holy Writ, and in the same devout observances which we know they kept up, and we too shall gain by degrees their practised eye—*ἐξ ἐμπειρίας ὁρᾶ*—whereby to discern their first principles. This would be one way, and on every account the best way, of convincing ourselves that the mysticism of the early interpreters is not the vague, unsettled, dreamy kind of view, which many of us are at first hearing apt to imagine. We may set ourselves to study the examples of it thoroughly in detail: and finding, as we shall in a great proportion of them, a great deal more than we had expected, we shall gradually and surely learn, both to value the method more highly, and to understand it better.

(3.) With this view, some examples have been given above: examples purposely selected, many of them, as the likeliest to startle and scandalize a mere modern reader; and something, it is hoped, has been done towards shewing, that in those cases at least the holy Fathers well knew what they were about; that they proceeded, in interpreting Scripture, on

the surest ground—the warrant of Scripture itself in analogous cases.

Another process, leading to the same conclusion, would be to examine, fairly and fully, whether there be not certain limitations which the Fathers carefully observe in their application of the mystical method; certain bounds within which they confine themselves, as did champions of old within the rules of the tourney, in the utmost heat and speed of their career. Some indeed of these rules are laid down in express words by the more exact and argumentative of the Fathers: others we may gather with sufficient assurance from the comparison of their comments. To this subject, then, the limitations of the mystical exposition, as they were generally recognized by Antiquity, we are to address ourselves in the present stage of the inquiry.

(4.) The first and most obvious of these rules of limitation was, not to lose sight of the letter; to reserve in every mystical comment the foundation of historical and literal truth. This, as all men know, is one of the points on which the Fathers have been most confidently assailed; but, as a few plain considerations will show, most unjustly.

For, first, the evidences of the Christian religion were from the beginning chiefly historical: such as the records of the life of CHRIST, the ministration of the Apostles, and the facts by which, in the old dispensation, God had authorized His messages by His prophets. The faith had been received in the first instance, as to the main body of it, in the plain literal and historical sense. It was so accepted by the mass of believers, as the Old Testament had ever been by the mass of the Jews; and surely appeal might be made without hesitation to those who are really versed in Christian Antiquity, whether even the most daring mystics among them do not all along assume the truth of the history; whether the mere allegory, which they sometimes appear to maintain, be at worst more than an exception to a general law; a resort in difficulties; a solecism, not a rule.

(5.) But secondly, if in any case they seem to press the allegory beyond this, there are considerations which would lead a sound critic to be cautious in urging their statements in that kind

§ III. 5. further than their very words oblige us to go. There are reasons which should induce us to give them all the benefit of any qualification or ambiguity which their expressions admit of,—to construe all that is equivocal in favour of the literal meaning. Were they not in a great measure free from some of the temptations, which have ever been found most effective, in inducing inconsiderate commentators to deal over freely with the letter of the Divine Records? These temptations have commonly arisen, on the one hand, from over refinement in philosophical and moral subjects; on the other hand, from critical skill, and dexterity in sifting statements on matters of fact. Of the first head, philosophical and moral allegory, something will be said by-and-by, when we come to the case of those Fathers, who are allowed to have erred in exaggerating the mystical sense. But their general deficiency in critical and historical acuteness is notoriously one of the most popular charges against them, and one of the reasons most frequently given for not deferring to their authority in Scripture interpretation. Those who judge so of them, must at least allow that they were, so far, exempt from that temptation to take liberties with the text of Scripture, which historical and critical difficulties continually offer.

For example, had Origen been as unversed in critical discussion, as were, on this hypothesis, the majority of the Fathers, he would not have been driven, by a supposed chronological difficulty, to throw discredit generally on the letter of the evangelical narrative. So at least he is supposed to have done, in commenting on St. John's account of our SAVIOUR's return to Galilee after the temptation. Not finding how to reconcile that account with those of the other Evangelists, he says¹, (if his words indeed are rightly so translated,) "The truth concerning these things must needs be lodged out of sight in their secondary and spiritual signification. The discrepancy being so accounted for, we need not relax in any measure our faith regarding the Gospel narratives, as though they were either untrue, or destitute of any peculiar divine inspiration, or failing in their proper office as

¹ In Joan. t. x. c. 2.

memorials." Then having stated the difficulty at length, he concludes, "In this and many cases besides, whoever will carefully examine the Gospels with a view to any disagreement in the narrative, it will either cause him with a sort of mental giddiness to give up the claim of the Gospels to absolute authority, and chuse one of them at random to adhere to, as not venturing to repudiate entirely the faith of our Lord; or, if he still admit all four, he will consider their truth to be lodged somewhere else, than in the outward material words, and letters, and syllables." The amount of Origen's meaning in this passage may perhaps be a subject of discussion by-and-by. At present it is quoted simply for the sake of pointing out the danger incurred by habits of searching criticism, *viz.* that it leads men, on discovering flaws, to them, incurable, to think more slightly than they ought of the letter of the Bible altogether. It is the genius of modern philology, to cut all such knots, by expressing or insinuating more or less of doubt, as to the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. Some of the ancients, not perhaps more logically, but with at least as much of religious awe and reverence, had recourse, we see, in the like cases, to the supposition of mere allegory intermixed with the truth. But the far greater number of them, being, as their opponents complain, quite "uncritical," *i. e.* taking the text as they found it, and not perplexing themselves with difficulties of construction and harmony, were free at least from this one undue bias towards the secondary sense.

(6.) A still stronger and more universal preservative must have been the unfeigned and singular veneration, with which they ever regarded the Holy Book. Whatever else may be laid to the Fathers' charge, even the most scornful and bitter of their censors have been constrained to admit the paramount value which they set on their Bibles, and their thorough acquaintance with them. Even where they mysticised improperly, their ordinary motive was a sincere veneration for the Scriptures; whose dignity, they sometimes with some plausibility argued, could not stand with the literal sense. This was a shortsighted and erroneous feeling, so far as it may have wanted that wise and simple faith, which

§ iii. 6.

§ iii. 6. would have caused them at once to receive the very letter, without hoping or pretending to explain all difficulties. Still, there was a feeling here of affectionate and dutiful though mistaken loyalty ; like St. Peter's, when he took hold of our Lord and began to rebuke and contradict Him ; saying, " Be it far from Thee, LORD ; this shall not be unto Thee."

Accordingly, when Origen goes off to the mystical sense, it is with him almost always a matter of reverent and earnest prayer.

Thus, having given a careful and sensible commentary on the literal account in Genesis of the building of the ark, he proceeds¹: " Now, first beseeching His indulgence, who alone is able to withdraw the veil from the reading of the Old Testament. let us try and make out what spiritual edification also is contained in the raising of this august fabric, the ark."

Again, in his exposition of the parable of the unmerciful servant²: " It is no small matter to express, according to the full meaning of our SAVIOUR, who are meant by the various persons introduced in this parable : . . . indeed, the very truth of these things, I am bold to affirm, no one shall be able to utter, unless the same JESUS, who privately expounded these things to His own disciples, have entered in to dwell in his mind, and open there all the treasures contained in the parable ; dark, hidden, far out of sight. . . . I, for my part,—as one who has not yet obtained in sufficiency that mind which can thoroughly penetrate and mingle with the mind of CHRIST, that mind which can go on and reach to the end of so great things, that mind which, aided by the SPIRIT, can search all, even the depths of GOD—am able as yet to form but an indefinite notion of the details of this passage."

The expression of awe is, perhaps, still more remarkable, when he draws back from an interpretation which he had actually entered on : as one who caught himself unawares intruding further into the sanctuary than he had intended. It is on the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard³: " Seeking out," he

¹ Hom. 2. in Gen. § 3. t. ii. 63. A. Ed. Bened. 1733.

² Comm. in Matt. xiv. § 11. t. iii. 629. B, C, E.

³ In Matt. xv. § 31. t. iii. 699. B.

says, "what might be the 'one day,' which limits the time of this parable, . . . I have unwarily taken some steps into certain of the deeps of Almighty God; lacking as I do that Spirit which searcheth all things, even the deep things of God." § iii. 7.

Surely the tone of mind here apparent could not exist, without a profound veneration for the letter itself and literal meaning, the garb and outward vehicle of truths so revered and precious. Surely it could have been only by comparison, if ever the same writers seem to disparage the letter. And in fact we find that few authors have done more for the elucidation of the historical sense, or given more unsparingly the best practical proof of reverence, unwearied religious diligence in trying to understand. So that with respect to the threefold method of interpretation, which he is known to have generally adopted, a partial judge might almost say of him, and of others like him, as contrasted with modern inquirers, that he had three Bibles to read and we but one; not a jot or tittle failing in his reverence for the *body* of the sacred Book, compared with ours, while he enjoys, what we generally want, the privilege of contemplating its *soul* and *spirit* also.

(7.) Now, if even Origen, the known champion of the allegorical method, felt and practised such regard for the Letter of Scripture, it is surely unnecessary to multiply quotations, in proof of the general opinion of the Church on that subject: her impartial veneration for the whole of the Divine Book, her deep, faithful, and undoubting reception of every part, both in its obvious and in its abstract senses, according to the fulness of the meaning of the SPIRIT of God. There is a striking passage in St. Augustin, which collects, as it were, into a point, the confessions on this head of every generation of believers¹. "The style itself in which Holy Scripture is framed, how open is it to every one's approach, how impossible to be searched out by any but a very few! What things it contains that are obvious and open, those, like a familiar friend, it speaks simply to the heart, both of unlearned and learned. As to those, on the other hand, which it hides in mysteries, neither does it elevate them by lofty speech, such as might deter from a nearer approach the dull and untaught

¹ Ep. 137. § 18. t. ii. p. 310.

§ iii. 8. mind, as a poor man sometimes fears to approach a rich one; but Scripture invites all by a lowly kind of speech, intending not only to feed all with obvious truth, but also to exercise and prove all by that truth which is remote from view: having in its easy parts whatever its hard parts contain. But lest, being open to view, they should incur contempt, the same truths again are made desirable by concealment; to meet the desire, they are, as it were, produced anew; and being so renewed, they insinuate themselves with a kind of delight. Thus wholesome correction is provided for corrupt minds, wholesome nourishment for feeble minds, and wholesome enjoyment for great minds. That mind alone is set against this teaching, which either through error knows not its healing power, or through sickness loathes it as medicine." Men who were so minded towards the whole Book of God,—would it not require overpowering evidence to convince us that they commonly passed by with disdain the letter of Scripture? yet they have been charged with no less than this.

(8.) The improbability of such allegations becomes yet more glaring, when we take into account the universal cast and tenor of the Fathers' doctrinal views. This is a consideration, indirectly indeed, yet really and materially, bearing on the present discussion. Ever since the Church began, she has felt that she had to guard against a tendency to over-refinement and affected spirituality. There has been danger lest the body, so to call it, of important truths, should be exhausted and exhaled away, in their supposed moral and imaginative meaning. This is the error of the people called Friends, and in general of the rationalists of modern days. It was also the error of the Gnostics of old, who denied, as is well known, the reality of the Incarnation and Passion of our LORD, the Resurrection of the Body, the identity of the CREATOR with the REDEEMER; and whatever other portions of Christian belief appeared to them in any way mixed up with things outward, material, and bodily. Against these, in the beginning as now, the Church of God always protested, maintaining the literal reality of these Truths, as she now maintains the real efficacy of material Sacraments, in opposition to the refinements of philosophy and vain deceit. Now it was a sort of index to this first

heretical school, their denying the historical meaning of Holy § III. 8.
Scripture ; as may be seen in many parts of Irenæus. His statements are like the following¹ : "These vainest of sophists maintain that the Apostles taught not truly but feignedly, according to the capacity of their hearers ; that they framed their answers to suit the prejudices of those who at any time were asking them questions ; discoursing with the blind blindly, according to their blindness, and with the sick according to their sickness, and with the erring according to their error. Thus, to such as imagined that the Creator was the only God, they made Him the subject of their preaching ; but to those who are able to receive the unutterable Father, they administered by parables and allegories the unspeakable mystery : thus making it out that our Lord and His Apostles gave instruction, not according to the tenor of the very truth, but in pretence, and according to the capacity of each."

Such are the complaints brought against heretical theorists, by the ecclesiastical writers of those days. Had we no direct evidence on the subject, passages of this sort would warrant us in concluding, that the early Church held to the literal Scripture as her foundation, whatever superstructure of mystical or moral truth she might know and believe herself entitled to build upon it. For there is a natural and very distinct analogy between the doctrines which reject the body, and the expositions which reject the letter. We perceive at once that they belong in their several kinds to the same turn of mind, the same school of opinions. And on the other hand, the straightforward unflinching faith, which is always content to take God's work as He has made it, will of course be willing also to accept His word as He has taught it. "When I hear of grass," says St. Basil², remarking on the excessive proneness to the mere allegory, by which some had explained away the history in the first chapter of Genesis, "when I hear of grass, I understand it to mean grass, and so of plants, and fishes, and beasts, and cattle ; all of them, as they are spoken, so I receive. For neither am I ashamed of the

¹ III. 5.

² Hexaëm. ix. 1.

§ iii. 9. Gospel." And a little further on : " In the oracles of the Spirit I desire to glorify Him, who has not employed our understanding on vain things, but has dispensed all so as to be written for our edification, and the perfecting of our souls. Of which truth, as I think, some not being aware, have tried, by I know not what allurements and figures of speech, to get the Scriptures credit for a kind of dignity, which in fact is of their own devising. But this is to make one's self wiser than the oracles of the Spirit, and under the show of interpretation, covertly to introduce matter of our own. As it is written then, so let our understanding be."

(9.) There occurs however in the history of early corruptions one case, which would appear at first sight to militate strongly against the reality of the connection here supposed, between fantastic doctrine and interpretation merely allegorical. I mean the case of Marcion of Pontus. He distinguished himself from the main body of the heretics of his time, by denying that Scripture was ever to be understood in any sense but that of the bare letter : at the same time that he agreed with them in rejecting the truth of CHRIST'S Body, the resurrection of our bodies, and the other doctrines above alluded to.

But see what line Marcion was obliged to take, in consequence of this extraordinary combination of opinions. He boldly discarded the whole of the Old Testament, as the work of an evil, at least of an inferior being. He retained moreover of the New Testament only one Gospel, St. Luke's, and the Epistles of St. Paul. And to make these at all seem to bear witness in his favour, he was constrained to dislocate and alter the text to a very considerable extent.

It is not within our present scope to show how inconsistent, after all, his admitted Scriptures were with his shadows of doctrine : Tertullian has done so at large, and with more, if possible, than his usual acuteness, in his two last books against Marcion : but the point material to be here noticed is, his sympathizing with the other heretics, and contradicting the Catholic Church, in his irreverence for the letter of Scripture : the only difference being, that he chose rather to take the ground of the Jews of his time, and, in effect, that of our modern rationalists, by denying

the inspiration of the portions which most perplexed him ; instead § iii. 10.
of wresting them, as most heretics did, by various figures, to his
own construction.

Thus it appears that the proceedings of Marcion form no
such exception as should invalidate the general rule ; and the
position stands good, that the Church of the Fathers, main-
taining as it did the doctrines which the Docetæ denied, was
very unlikely to give undue sanction to their merely allegorical
mode of interpreting Scripture ; just as the same Church, even
yet, arguing with rationalists, refuses to admit that " fire in
the prophecy of St. John the Baptist is quenched with the name
of the HOLY GHOST, or with the name of the SPIRIT, water dried
up in the words of CHRIST¹," concerning the new birth.

(10.) The drift of all these antecedent probabilities is this : that
whatever affirmations are found in ecclesiastical writers strongly
in favour of the letter of holy Scripture, are to be credited for
their full apparent amount ; but for those comparatively rare
instances, in which they have permitted themselves to speak
lightly of the literal meaning, every kind of allowance ought
to be made ; they must be taken, so to speak, at a considerable
discount.

Consider, for example, the opening sentences of St. Augustin's
treatise, "*De Genesi ad literam*²." " The whole Scripture
of God is twofold ; according to the intimation of our Lord,
when He said, ' Every scribe instructed into the kingdom of
heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, bringing out
of his treasure things new and old.' . . . In the relation there-
fore of things done, one has always to inquire whether each
particular is to be received in the figurative sense only, or to
be affirmed and maintained as to the actual verity of the
facts. For to deny that there *are* things to be figuratively
understood no Christian man will venture, remarking the words
of the Apostle, ' All these things befel them in figure ;' as also
where he commends to us, as a great mystery relating to CHRIST

¹ Hooker, E. P. v. 50. 3.

² t. iii. pars 1. p. 90 ; Ed. Bened. 1702.

§ iii. 10. and the Church, the expression in Genesis, 'And they two shall be one flesh.'"

This place has been quoted¹ as an instance of extravagance in urging the secondary sense, on account, probably, of the possibility intimated in one part of it, that in some cases there may be no true literal or historical sense. But, according to the rule above laid down for interpreting the Fathers on this subject, it is but fair to understand by St. Augustin's doubtful cases, those which may reasonably be considered more or less parabolical; such as Nathan's reproof of David, or our Lord's account of the Prodigal Son. It would be doing him injustice, to charge him with throwing doubt hereby on any part of the series of sacred history.

On the other hand, when we find the same Father arguing as follows in favour of the reality of Paradise, and of the history of our first parents, we need not hesitate to believe, that he meant his argument to extend, as by parity of reasoning it would extend, to every other portion of the regular inspired narrative. "Those²," says he, "of our faith, who believe these divine books, but like not to have Paradise understood according to the very letter, i. e. a most pleasant place, shaded with groves of fruit trees, of immense extent, too, and fertilized by a copious fountain; seeing as they do, without any labour of man, so many green glades overshadowed with forests by the secret working of the Almighty:— I wonder how they believe the corresponding narrative of the formation of the man, in a way like nothing which ever met their eyes. Or if that, too, must be understood figuratively; who begat Cain, Abel, and Seth? Were they likewise mere figures, not men born of mankind? I would advise men, therefore, narrowly to consider what is the drift of the notion they are inclined to assume, and to endeavour with us to understand all things, related as facts in the first instance, as they are literally expressed. That once done, every one will look kindly on their views of what the same things teach also by figurative expression, either of spiritual

¹ Whitby, Pref. in Dis. de Interp. S. S. p. lviii.

² De Genes. ad lit. viii. 4.

natures themselves and apiritual processes, or of events yet to come. §.iii. 10.

"I grant that if we could not receive in a bodily sense the things here named as bodily, without doing violence to the faith of the truth, nothing would remain but that we must understand them to be figurative expressions, rather than cast impious reflections on Holy Scripture. But if the bodily acceptation of these things be so far from embarrassing, that it rather more firmly establishes, the general statements of God's word, I should not expect to find any one so full of heathenish obstinacy, as to abide by any old opinion, which he may have formed in favour of the mere allegorical exposition, after seeing the whole explained literally in accordance with the Rule of Faith."

He then proceeds to state, as the very occasion of his writing that treatise, a wish to improve on a former exposition of Genesis, which he had undertaken against the Manichæans; and in which, not being able at that time to make out the literal meaning, he had assigned to many things an interpretation merely allegorical¹. "Still," says he, "even then, keeping in mind that which was all along chiefly in my wish though beyond my power, viz. that every thing in the first instance should be understood not in figure but literally, and not despairing altogether that such an understanding might be acquired, I expressed that feeling in the opening of the second book. My words are, 'Whosoever desires to understand every thing according to the sound of the letter, provided he can avoid blasphemies, and all that he affirms be agreeable to the Catholic Faith, his labours must not be taken grudgingly: rather we must account of him as understanding the Scriptures in the proper sense of the word, *understanding*.'" That such from the beginning was St. Augustin's feeling,—that he always preferred the literal sense as the foundation, and only had recourse to the purely figurative, when, as he conceived, the analogy of the faith required it,—he gave the most satisfactory proof, by going over the same ground, writing a more literal commentary, when in process of time maturer reflection had brought to his knowledge more of the literal meaning.

¹ De Gen. ad lit. viii. 5.

§ iii. 11, 12. (11.) I say, when the analogy of the faith required it ; for this is a very remarkable circumstance in the patristical mode of deviating from the letter of Scripture, especially as compared with those adopted by more modern interpreters : *viz.* that whereas these latter are commonly moved to set it aside by some apparent inconsistency with the truths of philosophy or history, some scruple of human reason ; the only sufficient plea for such deviation, in the judgment of such critics as St. Augustin, was the impossibility of reconciling the letter with the Rule of Faith. Thus, in the passage quoted above, the excepted cases are described as follows : “ Si nullo modo possent *salva fide veritatis* corporaliter accipi : ” “ Si nullus exitus datur, ut *pie et digne Deo* quæ scripta sunt intelligantur, nisi figurate proposita credamus.”

And let it not be imagined that by the phrase, “ *pie et digne Deo*,” a door is opened for the unlimited intrusion of each person's private judgment. The phrase is sufficiently explained by one which had occurred a few lines above : “ *prædicare omnia congruentia fidei catholicæ.* ” That was to be judged pious and worthy of God, which agreed, not with this or that man's preconceived notions of the divine proceedings and attributes, but with the body of scriptural truth set forth by the Church from the beginning.

If, then, we may suppose St. Augustin here to speak the general sense of ecclesiastical writers on this subject, we shall see that the utmost extent, to which the Church encouraged the use of the exposition by mere allegory, was to bear with it as a possible or at most as a probable hypothesis, in cases where the letter seemed irreconcilable with the analogy of the Faith ; always allowing for the chance of some more favoured commentator solving the difficulty without this extreme resort.

(12.) But the true ecclesiastical rule of interpretation will be put in a stronger light, if we consider the case of Origen and his school, and the degree in which they incurred the suspicion, if not the censure, of the Church. And we may notice, by the way, a remarkable instance of the hard measure which has been dealt out to the Fathers, by those who were resolved, at all events, for whatever reason, to derogate from their authority. It is the usual manner of proceeding, with such writers as Daillé, Whitby

Middleton, and the rest, to quote largely from the censures of § iii. 13. St. Jerome and others, pronounced on the Origenists for their extravagance in the allegorical way, and then to turn suddenly round, and use these same censures, as if they were applicable to the whole body of the Fathers; especially to St. Jerome himself and the rest who were eager in promulgating them.

But surely the censure might speak the opinion of the Church, though, from human infirmity and inconsistency, the persons pronouncing it might themselves incur it elsewhere.

Again, it should be well considered whether St. Jerome, St. Basil, and others, commonly quoted on this matter, are deprecating the allegorical system itself, or only the particular abuse of it now under examination, *viz.* the occasional suppression of the letter for the allegory's sake. It may be some help towards estimating rightly the judgment of the Fathers on the whole subject, if a few words be here added, first on the real amount of the concessions of the Alexandrian school in disparagement of the letter; next on the real amount of Church censure, properly so called, which that school incurred, on that ground, in the person of Origen, the most renowned, and therefore perhaps the most obnoxious, of all its champions.

(13.) And first, as to the extent of liberty taken by Origen with the literal sense of the Bible: it is but just to begin with stating, that his faith in the plenary inspiration of Holy Writ, those parts of it even which he is most accused of denying, is as unquestionable as it can be rendered, both by the tone of cordial reverence in every part, and also by repeated glowing professions like the following¹:

“By this brief demonstration of the divinity of *JESUS*, and application of the prophetic words concerning Him, we do in effect demonstrate at the same time the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures which prophesy of Him, and also of the writings which relate His sojourn here and His teaching; writings which were uttered with all authority and power, and have thereby become victorious over the elect portion of the Gentiles. It should be added that the divinity of the prophetic words, and the spirituality of Moses' law, shone forth only in consequence of the

¹ *De Princip.* iv. 6. t. i. 161.

§ iii. 14. [earthly] sojourn of JESUS. For evident proofs of the inspiration of the ancient Scriptures, before CHRIST's sojourn here, it was not possible to exhibit ; but the Law and the Prophets, before liable to suspicion, whether they were indeed things Divine, had a clear light cast on them by the residence of JESUS on earth, as being composed and written by a grace from above. And he who with care and attention studies the prophetic words, feeling as he will on the bare reading a kind of enthusiasm stealing over him, will be convinced by his feelings that they are no writings of men, which we believe to be the words of GOD. The light, too, which existed before in the Law of MOSES, wrapped up in a veil, shone forth at the time of our LORD's abode here ; the veil being taken away, and the good things, which were shadowed by the letter, coming gradually into full knowledge."

(14.) Next, I observe, that in general, *i. e.* with comparatively few exceptions, and those always particularly accounted for, Origen did not only receive the letter, but acknowledge the historical meaning, of the Holy Book. This will be sufficiently evident by a few citations, falling into two separate groupes. The first will consist of passages in which he inculcates his much canvassed maxim of a Triple Sense of Scripture : the other, of express or incidental cautions, in the course of his commentary, over and over enforced upon his hearers, not to lose sight of the letter in the brightness of the Spirit.

The Triple Sense of Scripture is most expressly set forth in a well-known passage of the Fourth Book *περί ἀρχῶν*¹. "We ought to transcribe into our own souls the meaning of the Holy Writings in three several ways : in the first place, that the simpler may be edified by what may be called the *flesh* or *body* of the Scripture, by which name we denote the obvious, literal acceptation : in the next place, that he who has attained to a certain height, may receive edification from that which is as it were the *soul* of the same Scripture : thirdly, that he who is perfect, and like those of whom the Apostle speaks as fit to have wisdom spoken among them—wisdom not of this world—that they too may be edified out of that *spiritual* law, which has the shadow of good things to come. For as man is compounded of body, and soul, and Spirit.

¹ § xi. t. i. 168.

so is the Scripture, dispensed by God by way of gift for the .§ iii. 14. salvation of men."

Again, in a noble passage of the fifth Homily on Leviticus¹,—which may be cited the more at length, on account of the light which it seems to throw on the analogy above alleged, as existing between the doctrines of the Fathers and heretics respectively, and their methods of interpreting Scripture :—"The details of the law concerning sacrifices are," he observes, "to be received in a different sense from that which the literal text points out. Else, when they are publicly read in the Church, they tend rather to the hindrance and subversion of the Christian faith, than to the admonition and edification of men. But if we search and find in what sense these things are said, and mark them, as they ought who think of God, who is the declared author of these laws; then the hearer will become a Jew indeed, but 'a Jew inwardly,' according to the distinction of St. Paul in the epistle to the Romans; which distinction of the inward and outward Jew, certain impious heretics not understanding, have withdrawn themselves not from the Scriptures only, but from God also, the Giver of this law and of the divine Scriptures to mankind, and have feigned to themselves another God, besides the Maker of Heaven and Earth: whereas, as you know, the verity of the faith holds one and the same God of the Law and of the Gospel, the Creator alike of visible and invisible things: the rather, because the things visible retain with invisible no small affinity; so that the Apostle affirms, 'the invisible things of God, from the creation of the world,' to be seen, 'being understood by the things which are made.' As therefore a mutual affinity exists between things visible and invisible, earth and heaven, soul and flesh, body and spirit, and of combinations of these is made up this present world: so also Holy Scripture, we may believe, is made up of visible and invisible parts: first, as it were, of a kind of *body* i. e. of the letter which we see with our eyes: next of a *soul*, i. e. of the sense which is discovered within that letter: thirdly, of a *spirit*, so far as it contains also in itself certain heavenly things; as says the Apostle, 'they serve to the example and shadow of things celestial.'

¹ § i. t. ii. p. 205.

§ iii. 16. "Such then being the case, let us, first calling on God, who made of Scripture both the body, and soul, and spirit—the body for those who were before us, the soul for ourselves, the spirit for those who in time to come shall obtain the inheritance of eternal life, whereby to win their way to the heavenly kingdoms;—let us now seek that *soul* of the law which I have mentioned, so far as belongs to our present subject."

(15.) One may remark, by the way, that the opening of this statement enables us in some measure to solve one principal difficulty connected with the allegorical method; viz. how it came to pass that in public and popular discourses, discourses to the unbaptized, Origen and others so continually and unreservedly publish these mystical expositions; expositions which themselves repeatedly compare to strong meat, hardly fit therefore for the babes and beginners in CHRIST. This is to be accounted for, probably, much in the same manner as the publication of the Three Creeds, and putting the mysteries of our faith in every one's mouth; it was in itself not desirable, nay rather contrary to Church principles: but the Jews and perverse heretics made it necessary, each endeavouring, for their own purposes, to maintain that the Old Testament was contrary to the New: a position which could not in strict reasoning be met satisfactorily, unless by divulging the secret of the allegorical meaning. Origen himself speaks feelingly of this difficulty, in the course of his remarks on the parable of the Unmerciful Servant¹. "But some one will say, are we not acting irreligiously in wishing these things to convey a meaning, because of the heavenly Book's secret and mystical nature in some parts? Are we not wrong in trying to expound these things? however accurately, for argument's sake, we may suppose ourselves to have made out the drift of them." The tenor of his answer is this: that it was by no means his custom, to trust his ordinary hearers with all the mysterious wonders, which he seemed to himself faintly to discern in Scripture, but that he always suggested those which he judged best for edifying: of which edification, one necessary groundwork would be, the securing the flock against the prevailing heresies.

(16.) But to proceed with our reasons for attributing, even to the

¹ In Matt. Hom. xiv. § 12, t. iii. p. 630. D.

allegorical school, a high respect for the literal sense. Clement § iii. 16. of Alexandria, Origen's predecessor, in discoursing on the *two* senses, (for it does not appear that it had occurred to him to distinguish the Moral from the Mystical; as Origen afterwards did, influenced perhaps by a desire to retain together with the Christian interpretation as much as he could of the morality which he admired in Philo¹;) Clement, I say, among other very many passages to the same effect, has one in which he refers to a Rabbinical tradition, remarkable at least for poetical force and beauty: that "when God took Moses to Himself, Joshua saw him in two forms; in one with angels, in the other on the mountains and among the ravines receiving sepulchral honours. This sight Joshua beheld from above, being lifted up in the SPIRIT, together with Caleb. . . . The drift of the history being, I suppose, to show that true knowledge does not belong to all, but some behold only the body of the Scriptures, the words and sentences, as it were the body of Moses: others see through to the meaning and the things signified by the words, making that Moses who is with the angels the object of their search. In fact, of those who called on the LORD Himself, the greater part said only, 'Son of David, have mercy on me;' but some few acknowledged Him to be the SON of GOD, as Peter; whom also He blessed, because not flesh and blood had revealed to him the truth, but His Father which is in heaven: whereby CHRIST showed, that the perfect Christian recognises the SON of the ALMIGHTY, not by the flesh which was conceived and born, but by the very power of the FATHER."

Such passages as these lose their force, except we understand the letter of Scripture to have, in the opinion of these writers, a real and substantial meaning, as the bodies of our LORD and of Moses were real and substantial.

The same remark may be made on the only place, that I know of, in which Clement seems to come near the Origenian doctrine of the three significations. "The purport of the law," he says, "we must take, either as declaring to us some sign," (*i. e.* as it may

¹ Strom. vi. c. xv. § 132.

§ iii. 17. seem, some instance of Divine interference.) "or as establishing some commandment for right conversation, or as uttering an oracle in the manner of a prophecy." Here it is plain that the first or historical meaning is by no means slighted or annulled, since to it is ascribed the office of declaring signs from heaven.

(17.) We may proceed now to some citations from Origen, belonging to the second of the two classes specified above : cases, namely, in which he warns his hearers, more or less expressly, that the letter is by no means abolished. First, there is a remarkable fragment produced by the Martyr Pamphilus, which, on the whole, we may cite without scruple, notwithstanding the suspicions cast by St. Jerome and others, on the good faith or genuineness of the *Apology for Origen*, which went under Pamphilus's name. For it has no relation to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which was the occasion of the corruptions specified by Jerome ; and again, it has all the internal evidence, which can arise from agreement with Origen's ordinary interpretations. Thus then Pamphilus represents him as speaking of the evangelical narrative generally¹. "Though these things have a spiritual meaning, yet the truth of the history being first established, the spiritual sense is to be taken as something over and above. For what if our Lord, in a spiritual sense, be always curing the blind, when He casts His light on minds blinded with ignorance : yet He did not the less at that time heal one corporally blind. And He is ever raising the dead : yet He did then really perform wonders of that kind also, as when He raised Jairus' daughter, and the widow's son, and Lazarus. And though at all times, when awakened by His disciples, He quiets the storms and whirlwinds of His Church : yet it is unquestionable that those things also, which are related in the history, really took place on that occasion. This therefore is the only sound way of receiving the sense of Scripture ; nor ought we to lend an ear to those who affirm, that He was born by Mary, not of Mary." In which last sentence the connection above noticed is obvious, between the historical sense and the Catholic doctrine.

The following are instances of detail, which prove how care-

¹ *Apol. pro Orig.* p. 36 ; *D. ad calc. Orig. Ed. Bened.* t. iv.

fully Origen carried this rule out in practice. In his commentary on our LORD's future coming in the glory of His FATHER with His angels, he had spoken thus¹, "Consider whether one may not say, that the Prophets in their sufferings of old bore an analogy to the WORD, which had no form nor comeliness; but as the SON of Man cometh in the glory of His FATHER, so the Words abiding in the Prophets appear with Him, having become Angels, keeping up in a kind of due proportion the glory which appertains to them." This allusive exposition, modestly enough proposed, he follows up with words of caution. "These things we say, by no means slighting the doctrine of the second coming of the SON of God, as it is more simply understood."

In the commentary on Genesis², he answers the trite objections to the history of the ark,—how it could contain such a multitude of animals, and the like,—by a calculation as to its admeasurement, which supposes the account literally true; and on this, as a foundation, proceeds to build his allegorical exposition; thereby shewing that he did not spare trouble to avoid the mere allegory, wherever it seemed possible.

When he comes to the birth of Isaac, having quoted the well-known passage from the Epistle to the Galatians, he asks³, "What then? was not Isaac born after the flesh? did not Sarah bear him? was not he circumcised? this very sport of his with Ishmael, did it not take place in the flesh? This is the remarkable point in the Apostle's exposition, that those things even, concerning which there can be no doubt of their having been done in the flesh, he affirms to be allegorical."

Having proposed a mystical interpretation of Abraham's marriage with Keturah and his second family, he adds an observation, which evinces that he did not think of annulling the historical sense⁴. "If we remember the historical notices of the generations derived from her, we shall the more easily make out [the truth.] about several nations mentioned in the Scripture, *c. g.*

¹ In Matt. xii. 30; tom. iii. 549. A.

² In Gen. Hom. 2 t. ii. p. 59—63.

³ In Gen. Hom. 7, § 2; t. ii. p. 78. C, D.

⁴ In Gen. Hom. 11, § 2; t. ii. p. 90. C.

§ iii. 18. where it is said that Moses married a daughter of Jethro the priest of Midian, which Midian we find was the son of Abraham by Keturah; whereby we learn that Moses's wife was of the seed of Abraham, and not an alien. . . . And the like you will find in the generations of Ishmael, which if you diligently look into, you will discover many points of *history* unperceived by the generality." Had it not been for these remarks coming in at the end, the whole tone of what he says about Keturah would lead one to suspect that he thought nothing of the literal sense: it is fair to conclude, therefore, that in other cases, where he is merely silent regarding it, he does by no means intend to disparage it.

(18.) Further, I observe that many of the passages, in which he seems at first positively and expressly to reject the historical sense, not only may, but in fairness must, be explained with very great mitigations. Sometimes he is only speaking by comparison, employing the same kind of figure as did the Prophet, when he wrote, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." Thus in discoursing of the history of Isaac¹, he says, "As in the LORD there is nothing bodily, so in all these things take care to understand nothing bodily." Which words sound indeed like a plain denial, first of the reality of our LORD's Incarnation, secondly of the truth of the narrative concerning Isaac: yet it is evident in the same page² that Origen was orthodox in the former respect; for he explains the real offering of the ram to represent the real suffering of CHRIST in the flesh, and the figurative offering of Isaac to represent the impassibility of the Divine Word in the hour of crucifixion; and we have seen before that he specifies the history of Isaac as an instance of the allegory not impairing the truth of the letter. Who does not see then that the expression, "nothing bodily," must be taken in both clauses comparatively; "nothing *merely* outward and bodily?" And in all candour the same qualification should be adopted in all similar cases, wherever the context, or his opinion otherwise known, does not oblige us to understand him as going further. For example, a little further on in Genesis, having to explain a phrase which seems

¹ In Gen. Hom. viii. 10. t. ii. p. 83.

² Ibid. § 9.

tautological, he says¹, "As I have often had occasion to observe, § iii. 19.
in these things not histories are related, but mysteries are framed
and put together:" evidently meaning *not so much* histories as
mysteries: and implying that details, which might appear trifling
or irrelevant, if considered only in themselves, are often amply
accounted for, when you go to the secondary sense: a rule of
sacred criticism, which is surely no way objectionable.

So again, in a fragment of a later part of his commentary on
Genesis², remarking on the fear expressed by the sons of Jacob,
lest "Joseph should take them for bondsmen and their asses,"
he says, "It is improbable what is told of the sons of Jacob, that
when they imagined themselves in so evil case they should have
thought at all of their asses: except the expression is used alle-
gorically." By which we may understand him not to deny the
fact of their so speaking, but to account for their being directed
to such expressions.

Also in the account of the destruction of Ai: "When the Jews
read these things," says he³, "they make themselves cruel, and
thirst after human blood," "putantes quia et sancti ita percus-
serunt eos qui habitabant Ai:" i. e. acting upon the idea that the
saints did so and so; not as if the idea were a false one, but as if
they reasoned wrongly upon it: for a sentence just before shews
that this is one of the places to be expounded comparatively.
He had said, "These⁴ things which follow, belong *rather* to
the truth of the mystery than of the narrative."

(19.) It may be as well to note here, that the word *μύθος*, or
fabula, for applying which to certain Old Testament histories,
Origen has been very sharply censured, both in ancient and in
modern times, did by no means imply, in his acceptation of it, the
falseness of the history so denominated. For he uses it of the
history of Lot and his daughters, which he calls "*famosissima fa-
bula*:" and yet it is clear from the whole context, that he believed
the narration, and reasoned on it as real. We ought not, there-
fore, to be too much startled, when we find him using the word

¹ In Gen. Hom. x. 4. t. ii. p. 88.

² On c. 43. 13. t. ii. p. 48. E.

³ In Jesu Nave Hom. viii. 7. t. ii. p. 417. B, C.

⁴ Ibid. § 6.

⁵ In Gen. Hom. v. 3. t. ii. p. 74. F.

§ iii. 20. *fables*, concerning the history of Paradise, and of man before the Fall: though it cannot be denied, that on this particular point he has trespassed on the honour of the letter, and has taken occasion from the evident figure contained in certain phrases (such as "they heard the voice of God walking in the garden,") to affirm that the whole of what then took place is told only in symbol and parable: not (observe) denying that it conveys a real history, but that the said history is throughout written, as it were, in hieroglyphics. We are not of course called on to justify this proceeding, but it is desirable, on many accounts, to observe how far the error went.

(20.) We may just mention two other instances, on the former of which the accusers of Origen have very generally delighted to dwell. Both of them, however, a candid construction might perhaps solve on the principle now under consideration: *viz.* by supposing him rather to assert the superior importance, than the exclusive truth, of the mystical interpretation. They both occur in the process of harmonizing the Gospels: the former in the accounts of our Lord's going down to Galilee, in the early part of His ministry; the other in those of His anointing, whether that occurred once, twice, or three times.

In the first instance, which has been already quoted for another purpose, Origen's¹ remark is, or appears to be (for there is an evident mutilation of the text:) "The very truth about these things must needs be stored up in the mystical exposition. If the discrepancy could not be solved, our faith concerning the Gospels must needs be impaired; as though they were either untrue, or uninspired, or as narratives not felicitously arranged." Then having stated the difficulty, and challenged the opponents of the mystical sense to solve it on any other hypothesis, he remarks in general on the Gospel narratives. "There are many other cases, in which minute inquiry into the apparent historical discrepancies of the four Gospels will lead to one or other of these results; either the inquirer, feeling a kind of giddiness, will give up the task of verifying them all in the strict sense, and will take up with one or other of them as it may happen; or, receiving the

¹ In Joan. Comm. x. 2. t. iv. 162. B.

whole four, will admit also that their truth does not lie in the outward and bodily characters wherein they are written." § III. 20.

To make his meaning plainer in this first clause, he puts the case¹ of four persons, favoured with visions, relating the same Divine interposition, but varying in such a minute circumstance as this; that the one saw the heavenly form sitting, the other standing; yet each with truth represents that which his own mind perceived. And considering that the doings of our Lord on earth were a series of Divine visions, "why," he says, "should we blame the Evangelists, for sometimes giving, as it were, each a turn of his own to the things done by our Lord, according to His miraculous and most inconceivable power;—sometimes interweaving into their narrative, in language taken from sensible things, what was revealed to them in a sense purely spiritual? Why should we blame them, though for edification's sake they sometimes transpose facts, relating a thing in such a connexion, as to make it seem to have happened in one place or time, when in fact it happened in another?" And then he makes the observation so severely censured. "It was their purpose, when circumstances allowed, to speak truth both spiritually and literally; but where both could not be, to prefer the Spirit to the letter, the spiritual truth being often preserved in what we may perhaps venture to call the literal and bodily falsehood."

In the other passage to be considered together with this², he first states strongly the discrepancies of the literal sense, on the supposition that the several accounts of the woman anointing our Lord all relate to the same event; and the consequent reasonableness of supposing that they related to several persons and events. Then he adds, in a way which is readily understood as implying that he is now come to the solution which himself prefers, "Perhaps some one rather bolder than ordinary will say, whether historically it were some one woman only who did an act of this kind, or whether you choose to suppose another, or a third; still, I say, first, that the main object of the Evangelists had respect to certain mysteries; secondly, that they were not so very anxious to relate according to historical truth, as to set forth

¹ Ibid. § 3, 4.

² In Matt. Comm. Series, § 77. t. III. p. 892, 3.

- § iii. 21. the mysteries which arose out of the history. On which account also they added certain discourses, suitable to, and in harmony with, the meaning of those mysteries."

(21.) Now concerning both these passages, let it not be thought mere partiality, if we construe them as affirming no more than a *comparative* exclusion of the literal meaning, a wish to enforce attention to the *spirit*, a deprecation of any thing like unbelief or scepticism on account of literal difficulties; answering very nearly to what is commonly said among ourselves, when objections are alleged against the Scriptures from supposed geological, astronomical, or other like incongruities, involved in their letter. They are objections, people say, of a *wrong kind*; it was not the object of the Scriptures to teach those matters. So here, comparatively speaking, we may understand this Father to say, "It was not the object of the Evangelists, simply to teach what happened to our Lord on earth, but to teach it with a view to the heavenly and Divine truths concerning Him."

Just as of the history at the beginning of Exodus he says¹, "These things are not written for us," *ad historiam*, "as mere matters of history: neither are we to suppose that the divine books are relating the doings of the Egyptians." It is evident from the context, that he here means "*simply* relating, for relating's sake:" that he is far from denying the verity of the letter, however he may seem to undervalue its importance. In such cases he may be regarded as endeavouring to account, not so much for any supposed *untruth* in a narrative, as for its being constructed in a way to make it look untrue.

A case very much in point would be the statements, undoubtedly conflicting at first sight, of the process which our Lord adopted for healing the blind men at the gate of Jericho. Origen would say, and has said², that such appearance of disagreement did not come of itself; that it was framed on purpose, to draw attention to the moral and mystery of the transaction; which, in every such case, will be found to be wonderfully brought

¹ In Exod. i. § 5. t. iii. p. 131. E.

² Comm. in Matt. tom. 16. § 12. t. iii. 732.

out, by a search wisely instituted to remove the historical difficulty. § iii. 22.

(22.) A further mitigation of the censure due to him on this head may be derived from a remark of his Editor, De la Rue, who certainly was at least enough on his guard against an editor's partiality for his author. He states it as a strange, yet certain fact, that Origen perpetually confuses the literal interpretation of a passage as distinct from the mystical, with the literal sense of the words as distinct from the metaphorical¹. "*Quod pæne incredibile videtur, Origenem latuit discrimen quod literam inter et verborum literalem sensum intercedit.*" It would have been a more guarded, and perhaps a more correct manner of speaking, had he said only, that Origen sometimes writes as if he were not aware of this difference.

To make the thing plain by example: among other instances of the New Testament having, as well as the Law, a letter which killeth, Origen alleges² the precepts of our LORD, "If any man hath a purse, let him take it, and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one:" and "salute no man by the way;" and *εἰσιν εὐνοῦχοι, οἱ εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν*. These passages, all men will allow to be figurative ways of expressing a real precept. Now his oversight was, that he applied the same principle to passages, which seemed to him fraught with historical difficulties: as in the account of Sarah and Abimelech, of Isaac and Rebecca, and of the midwives of Egypt; where his expressions are such as these: "If any one chuse to understand this *merely* according to the letter, he ought to seek his hearers rather among Jews than among Christians³," and "think you that these are no better than tales, and that the HOLY GHOST is merely relating histories?" and "if we take what is written concerning the midwives according to the historical narrative, it appears that such and such a thing cannot stand⁴." Yet if the several histories be examined, it will be seen that to deny the truth of the fact is by no means necessary to his argument: the ends of

¹ Pref. in t. li. p. xvii. ² Comm. in Matt. t. xv. 2. tom. lii. 653.

³ In Gen. Hom. vi. l. t. ii. p. 76, D. ⁴ In Gen. Hom. x. 2. t. li. p. 87. F.

⁵ In Exod. Hom. ii. l. t. ii. p. 133. E.

- iii. 23. which are sufficiently answered, by supposing him to deny, that this or that turn of expression was designed to be taken literally. Nay, even according to his unfriendly editor's statement, if he were not sufficiently aware of the distinction between phrases mystical and merely metaphorical, he was very likely to mean the milder assertion, *i. e.* that the figurative expression was designedly made paradoxical, when he *seems* to advance the stronger, *i. e.* that it wanted the foundation of literal truth.

For these and other like reasons, even though the school of Origen were a fair specimen of the old ecclesiastical interpretation, it would not follow that that interpretation could be charged with denying the letter, except in rare and difficult cases, where, as he has himself said, we miss altogether the historical meaning: "*defectum patitur historialis intelligentia* ¹."

(23.) But the matter is thrown out of all doubt, when we add to what has been said, the fact that the Church has virtually disowned all responsibility for the peculiar opinions of this renowned Father; partly by the sentence of a general Council, partly by the deliberate judgment of some of her chief lights of later days. It is in some respects unfortunate, that that portion of the fifth general Council, which contained the proceedings against those called Origenists, has not come down to our time: but in the decisions of the Council, it is to be observed, that no mention is made of the denial of the letter of Scripture, as one of the supposed errors of Origen. The errors which were maintained in his name,—most of which may be described as mere conjectures, expressed as conjectures by him, and afterwards advanced to the rank of tenets, philosophical or theological, by speculators who made the most of so high a sanction; such as the pre-existence of souls, the manner in which the merits of the Redeemer may be applied to angelic natures, the supposed universal renovation, and the like:—these errors are enumerated in fifteen articles²; but the alleged abandonment of the literal sense of the Bible does not appear among them. However, the whole affair, coming as it does at the conclusion of three centuries of

¹ Hom. in Gen. vii. 5, t. ii. 80. B.

² Vid. Harduin. Concil. t. ii. p. 286—288.

dispute, shows that there was no such blind deference to his authority, then or at any former time, as may render the Church liable, on his account, to the charge of disparaging the letter of Holy Scripture. § lii. 24.

(24.) The opinions of the most celebrated Fathers are collected by the Benedictine editor, in his preface to the second volume¹. Such as the sentiment of St. Basil, in a passage quoted above²: "I know the laws of allegory, though not by my own invention, yet by acquaintance with the labours of others: according to which, they who will not receive the ordinary sense of what is written, in the account of the Creation for example, affirm water not to mean water, but some other nature; and plants and fishes they expound at their own pleasure; and the formation of creeping things, and of wild beasts, they pervert according to inventions of their own, much like those who profess to interpret dreams." St. Chrysostom again, as cited by De la Rue, remarks, that the geographical situation of Paradise, "eastward in Eden," may have been purposely inserted by the Sacred Spirit, "to prevent those who are inclined to useless talk from deceiving the ears of the simple, by stating that Paradise is not in earth but in heaven, or putting about any other the like mythological dreams³."

It is to be observed, that neither these Fathers, nor St. Augustin when he expresses similar sentiments, make any mention of the name of Origen: although Augustin, in more than one passage, condemns him by name, for the same doctrinal errors which were afterwards censured in the second Council of Constantinople. But they seem to have observed a kind of tenderness towards him, which makes their express warnings the more striking, and at the same time leaves room to suppose, that, according to the view which has been taken above, they might regard him as rather leading others to deny the letter of the Bible, than as being himself guilty of such an error on any large scale.

St. Jerome and Epiphanius, as is well known, were less scrupulous in their attacks on Origen, probably (at least in part) as living among persons who were continually pushing his specu-

¹ P. xxiii.² Hexaëm. Hom. ix. § i.³ In Gen. Hom. xlii. t. i. p. 80.

- § iii. 25. lations into heresy. Nothing can be more express than their protests against him¹, addressed to John, Patriarch of Jerusalem, for turning the Scriptures into mere allegory, as far as the history before the fall was concerned.

Yet, as is often sarcastically alleged by the detractors of the Ancients, not even Origen himself abounds more in mystical and figurative interpretations than did these two distinguished Fathers, St. Jerome and St. Augustin. Are we to conclude that such men wrote at random, and did not know their own mind on such a very serious point, as a rule of interpretation extending through the whole Scriptures? Must we not rather conclude, that their censure of Origen as an allegorist, which, generally speaking, we may accept as the censure of the Church, went thus far, and no further? *viz.* to blame him for supposing that the literal sense would ever entirely vanish, however impossible it may be for us at times to ascertain it, and however inferior it may generally or always be, in comparison with the mystical sense: to blame him, again, for objecting to it, as he sometimes occasionally does, (contrary however to his own declared rule) on grounds not flowing from the analogy of the faith as held and interpreted by the Church, but such as we should call rationalistic; such as a thing being to our minds inconsistent with the majesty of the Deity. Lastly, and perhaps principally, we may understand them to blame him for too great boldness and luxuriance, in advancing interpretations, not in any way received by tradition, but devised by his own thoughts. But not in any sense can they be said to condemn him simply for maintaining the double sense of the old Scriptures, in the very way, wherein, as we have seen, the whole body of Christian writers, from St. Barnabas and St. Clement downwards, had maintained it.

(25.) And this is true not only of Jerome and Augustin, whose love for allegory is well known, but also of the other two great names, Basil and Chrysostom, who are comparatively remarkable for reserve in such interpretations. Yet Basil, on the Psalms, repeatedly refers to our LORD expressions which would be com-

¹ Epiph. Epist. ad Joan. Ierosolym. ap Hieron. t. i. 247, &c.; Ed. Vallars. 1766; Hieron. contra Joan. Ierosol. § 7; t. ii. 413.

monly interpreted of the Psalmist only. And Chrysostom (to say § iii. 25.
nothing of his practice) in the very passage which is cited from
him as so decidedly condemning Origen, points out the neces-
sity of understanding all things θεωρητικῶς¹. “ ‘The LORD GOD
planted Paradise.’ Consider, beloved; if we do not understand
these things in a sense becoming the ALMIGHTY, we shall needs
be carried over a deep precipice. For what can they say con-
cerning this word, ‘planted,’ who dare to take all the words
spoken concerning the DEITY in a human sense? Did God need
tools and husbandry, and other such process, to adorn Paradise?
God forbid. . . . Against this,” as against the mere allegory, “let
us stop our ears, and follow the rule of the Scripture. And
when thou hearest, ‘God planted a garden in the East,’ take
care to conceive of the word ‘planted’ in a divine sense concerning
God, that He gave order for such a thing to be; but as to the
next word, believe thou that Paradise really was formed, and in
that place where the Scripture hath pointed it out. For not to
believe the things set down in the divine Scripture, but rather
to introduce other things of one’s own mind, must, I conceive,
bring extreme danger to those who venture on such a pro-
ceeding.” On the other hand, in his exposition of the 47th
Psalm², he says, speaking of the verse, “O clap your hands, all
ye people;” “With reason might one take this Psalm according
to the mystical sense, rising above the literal meaning. For
though it take its beginning and prelude from things sensible,
yet it guides the hearer to the things which are merely spiri-
tual. For, as I have said before, so now I say again, some
things we must take as they are said, some contrary to the
letter; *e. g.* when it is said, the wolf shall lie down with the
lamb. Some in both senses; as the sacrifice of Abraham, and
the first paschal lamb.” Compare this passage with the former,
and it will be plain that while St. Chrysostom was earnest in con-
demning the too free speculations of a later age, there was nothing
in his principles contrary to the mode of exposition, which, as we
have seen, was adopted by the Fathers before Origen.

On the whole, we may assume that the Mysticism of the ancient

¹ Hom. 13, in Gen. t. i. p. 80, liii. 29, Ed. Savile.

² t. i. 652, 16.

- § iv. 1. Church (whatever might be said of some individuals) was very far from interfering with the truth of the history. The next point will be to show, that neither did it interfere with moral truth, i. e. it did not, by prophetic exposition of certain questionable parts of the Patriarchs' conduct, annul or confound the judgment of the well informed moral sense, as to the rectitude of such conduct. This however must be made matter of separate investigation.

§ iv.—*Mysticism as applied to the Moral Difficulties of Scripture.*

It has been endeavoured in the former sections, first, to shew distinctly what is meant, when the Fathers are charged with Mysticism, and to point out by example the need of extreme caution and reverence, whenever we approach that subject. Secondly, granting the fact that they are, generally speaking, Mystics, at least in the interpretation of Scripture, (for to that in its present stage the inquiry is limited) a reason was however adduced for believing that they were not so at random, nor in mere blind obedience to the literary fashion of the day. The reason is this, that we find them, with few and rare exceptions, careful to limit their mystical expositions, so as not to destroy the historical and literal meaning. The exceptions, chiefly drawn from the Alexandrian school, were shortly considered, and appeared in themselves less formidable than they are sometimes represented: it appeared moreover, that whatever their amount, they so far tend to strengthen our argument, as they occasioned an anxious disavowal of the mere allegory, on the part of St. Basil, St. Augustin, and others, who had the best claim to be regarded as representing the whole Church. Their verdict is correctly reported in the following passages from Cyril of Alexandria¹.

“In the inspired writings those who shrink from the literal and historical meaning as unsound, are chargeable in effect with something very like shrinking from the only process, which can enable them to understand the things therein set down. For

¹ In Esai. lib. i. 4; t. i. p. 113.

the investigation of them in the mystical way is indeed noble and profitable; it tends to enlighten thoroughly the eye of the mind, and greatly to advance us in good understanding: nevertheless, as often as any historical fact is introduced to us by the Scriptures, then surely, if ever, it becomes us to trace out the profitable use of the history, that the divine Scripture may do its work, saving and helping us in all ways." This was in agreement with the rule, which he had laid down for himself in the beginning of his commentary on the Pentateuch¹. "Our exposition will be useful, if we first consider the facts, as they really took place, and make part of history; and having as we may completed that view, if we then new-mould our statement, passing from the type and shadow to the clear account of the inward signification; our discourse having all the way a bearing on the Mystery of CHRIST, and tending to Him as its limit; since it is an unquestioned truth, that CHRIST is the end of the Law and the Prophets."

§ IV. 2.

Such had been the line of interpretation, which the Fathers of the first age, by a kind of sacred instinct, adopted from the beginning: and in no other did those of the fourth and fifth ages acquiesce, after full examination, and abundant opportunity of judging how far it was likely to be abused.

(2.) We have now to consider this mystical method in its application to one class of texts in particular; those portions, namely, of the Old Testament history, which record actions of questionable morality on the part of God's favoured servants. So it is, that in modern times, even among those who appear truly to reverence the Bible, there is commonly adopted, in regard of these startling passages, a tone of explanation and remark, very different from that which prevailed in the early ages of the Church. It seems desirable, for many reasons, to ascertain the amount of that difference, and how it may be best accounted for. We may find perhaps that the patristical mode of interpretation, rightly understood, interferes as little with moral as it before was found to interfere with historical truth; and the whole discussion may tend to convince us, that on this, as on

¹ T. I. p. 2. C. ed. Aubert. Paris. 1638.

§ iv. 3, 4. most theological subjects, we have much more to learn from the Fathers, than to apologize for in them.

(3.) That the Fathers, deeply as they were versed in every part of the inspired writings, were fully aware of this kind of Scripture difficulty, one might be certain beforehand, on considering that it is a difficulty which occurs to every person, even to children, perusing the Old Testament with an ordinary degree of attention. Nor do we find commonly in their writings any desire to evade the subject, or to draw off attention from it. There were controversies indeed in the four first ages, which would have forced it continually on their thoughts as polemical writers ; such as that with the Marcionites first, and afterwards with the Manichæans, who used the startling parts of the sacred history, as proofs that the Old Testament came from an evil, or at least from an imperfect, Being : or again, that which they had constantly to maintain with the Pagan Philosophers, who, as appears from Celsus and Julian, were not slow to employ this topic against Christians and Jews alike : but the remarkable thing is, that the same narrations are produced, and discussed without reserve, in their practical and popular writings also, their pastoral letters to individuals, and their homilies *ad populum*. There seems no desire on their part to withdraw these things from common observation, such as we now find not unfrequently, even among those who on other grounds would encourage the freest discussion and circulation of the Scriptures. Their reserve, their secret discipline, so perplexing to many in our days, did not extend to these things.

(4.) Neither do we find that even those, who took the greatest liberties in allegorizing, who came nearest in some instances to the denial of the letter,—not even that such as Origen,—thought themselves warranted in getting rid of the moral difficulty, arising from the places in question, by resorting to the mere allegory. They did so, or appeared much inclined to do so, where the literal statement seemed physically or historically impossible : occasionally also where it seemed very trifling or frivolous ; but it is not so easy to meet with a passage, where the same solution is applied to any narrative, merely on the ground of its apparent

immorality; which yet, with our modern notions, would seem § iv. 4
to be the most tempting ground of all.

This remark is made with all the hesitation, which becomes one who ventures on a sweeping statement after a very limited induction. But should it be found on the whole correct, it is surely a very considerable circumstance, and may help to convince us that these early theologians knew well what they were about, and did not use their solutions at random, just as difficulties happened to press, or ingenious answers came to hand. Celsus, as it appears from Origen¹, charged the apologists of the Bible with this very artifice; "that the more plausible among them, being ashamed of certain portions of their sacred books, take refuge in the allegorical meaning:" and among other instances from the Book of Genesis he alleged the disputes of Jacob and Esau, the conduct of Rebecca, the histories of Lot and of Jacob's family. Origen's answer in effect comes to this²: he disavows all intention of denying the fact in such histories as those above mentioned. "In many instances," says he, "the word [of God], hath made use of *real transactions*, and recorded them so as to exhibit things greater, covertly indicated, *such as are*" (among others) "*the marriages and various connections of the righteous men [of old]*." Farther on he contrasts the patriarchal narrative with the foul and revolting fictions of the Greek mythology; which, as he observes, were indeed full of shamefulfulness, taken in their first acceptation, relating as they did to their very gods and the sons of their gods; and having enforced this by the virtual confession of those Greek philosophers, such as Chrysippus, who had laboured to make out the symbolical purport of their fables, he proceeds as follows: "Because of these things—because of such fables as these and others innumerable, we for our part are unwilling to go so far as even in name to call the Supreme God (*e. g.*) Jupiter; or the Sun, Apollo; or the Moon, Diana. But exercising pure religion towards the Creator, and concerning His works, which are very good, using none but good and auspicious words, not even by a name do we pollute the things of God: accepting what Plato says in the *Philæbus*:

¹ Contr. Celsum, iv. 48, 43, 45.

² Ibid. § 44; t. p. 537, B.

§ iv. 5. 'so great,' says he, 'is the dread which I feel concerning the names of the gods.' We also, of a truth, are full of dread concerning the Name of our God and His good creatures, to that degree, that never could we admit, even under pretence of symbolical language, any tale or fable which tends to the corruption of the young¹." The argument of this passage may seem to require explanation. It may be briefly stated thus. "The fact is well known that believers in the Bible decline even the metaphorical use of the names of the heathen gods; so great is their abhorrence of the impious immoral stories with which those names are associated; judge you then whether they are likely, under any pretence of allegory, to admit, as vehicles of their own doctrines, stories really base and immoral."

From all this it is sufficiently manifest, that the line of defence taken by Origen, and *a fortiori* by those who were less prone to allegory, would be, to vindicate on their own grounds the moral tendencies of the several statements objected to, assuming their historical truth. How far such his vindications were or were not independent of the allegorical meaning, which he also asserted, and for which he argues at large in this very passage, is another question, to be considered hereafter in its place.

(5.) Now there is a strong presumption, at first setting out, against the supposition that the Fathers dealt lightly with this class of Scripture difficulties, that they trifled with them, or treated them in a way to disturb men's notions of morality. For it is a certain fact, that the early Christian moralists, whether nominally attached to any particular school or no, were none of them in any sense Epicureans nor utilitarians. They all held, expressly or by instinct, a moral sense in the heart of man, and its correlative, a real difference of right and wrong in human conduct, independent of all results.

It was partly on this ground that they preferred to all others the schools of Pythagoras and Plato, a preference which is fully stated and accounted for at large by St. Augustin, in his eighth Book on the City of God. A few passages may be given, as tending to show what line Christian philosophers (for in their name generally St. Augustin is speaking, and not of his own

¹ Contr. Celsum, p. 48, t. i. p. 540.

private opinions) would be likely to pursue on delicate points of casuistry. § iv. 5.

With regard then to the moral sense : "Far be it from us," he exclaims¹, "to think of comparing the Platonists with those, who make the bodily senses the standard of truth, and pronounce them, faithless and deceitful as they are, the rule and measure of all propositions ; as do the Epicureans and all of the like sort : as the very Stoics also themselves, who in their fond affection for Dialectic, as they term it, *i. e.* for the art of ingenious argumentation, have imagined that even it might be best derived, ultimately, from the bodily senses ; affirming that from no other source does the mind conceive the notions which they call primary (ideas, *i. e.* of certain things which their theory goes on to define particularly), and from which is deduced and framed the whole process of learning and of teaching . . . But the Platonists (deservedly therefore preferred by us) distinguish what the mind beholds from what strikes on the bodily senses ; neither denying to the senses what they are capable of, nor assigning to them more than they will bear. But the light of the mind, whereby all things are to be learned, they affirmed to be no other than the God by whom all things were made."

A little further on, he writes as follows : (The passage is here quoted, not so much for the astonishing depths which it discloses of what may be called Christian Philosophy, as because the author states himself to be speaking not his own private sentiments, but the feeling, avowed or instinctive, of the whole Church².) "So far as the Platonists agree with us, concerning one God, the Author of this universe, who is not only above all bodies, Himself incorporeal, but also above all souls, Himself incorruptible, our Source, our Light, our Good—so far we prefer them to all others. What if any Christian, ignorant of their literature, use not their terms in disputation, (how should he, since he never learned them ?) what if he neither call that branch Physics, which treats of inquiry into things natural ; nor that Logic, which analyses the process whereby truth may be discerned ; nor that Ethics which treats of conduct,—of the chief good to be sought, and the chief evil to be

¹ De Civ. Dei, viii. 7. ² Ibid. cap. 10.

§ iv. 6. avoided? he knows nevertheless that all three are from the one true and most bountiful God; both our nature, whereby we are formed according to His image; and the doctrine, whereby we may know both Him and ourselves; and the grace, whereby, cleaving to Him, we may be perfectly blessed. Behold here the cause of the preference we give to the Platonists: that while other philosophers have worn out their toil and their talents in searching out the causes of things, the rules of learning and of life; these alone, acknowledging God, have found the cause of the world as it is, the light of all truth that may be attained, the fountain of all bliss that may be tasted. Be these philosophers then Platonists, or whoever else of whatever nation, who think thus of God, they think with us."

(6.) In Origen we have repeated disavowals of the principles of the other sects, and repeated acknowledgments of the remarkable coincidence between the principles of Plato's morality, and those which the Gospel divinely sanctions. Of the former class, the following is a specimen¹: "The Christians are likened by Celsus to one, who professing to cure bodily sickness, should withdraw men from skilful physicians, for fear of having their own ignorance detected. But who, I ask, are these physicians, from whom we thus withdraw the simple? . . . Suppose it, for example, to be the philosophy of Epicurus, and of those who belong to his school, . . . what do we that is not most reasonable, liberating men from that evil disease, the result of the treatment of these favourite physicians of Celsus: I mean the denial of Providence, and recommendation of pleasure as the chief good? Or what again, if we draw off our disciples from those other physician-philosophers who are called Peripatetics; denying as they do all providence over mankind, all relation between God and man? what is this but an exercise of piety on our part, and a real mental cure to those whom we influence? . . . Grant, again, that there are others, whom we separate from the physicians of the Stoical class, the maintainers of a corruptible God of a bodily and perishable substance: . . . in this case too, can any one deny that we shall be delivering those who will believe us

¹ In Cels. iii. 75.

from many evils, and introducing them to the doctrine of true piety, the doctrine of resignation to the CREATOR of the world?" § iv. 7.

To this rejection of all other theories, he elsewhere adds express approbation of Plato's, of which perhaps no instance can be adduced more remarkable than this: "Let those who are able to understand receive the instruction of ancient and wise men; of Plato especially, the son of Ariston; let us hear what he says in a certain letter concerning the chief good: let us attend to him, affirming, 'the first and chiefest good can in nowise be uttered in words, but is first generated by long habit, and then on a sudden, as though by fire, starting into a blaze, is kindled like a light in the soul.' Which words we also hearing, assent unto them as excellently spoken: for it was God Himself who revealed to them those things, and whatsoever else has been rightly taught by them."

(7.) To the same purpose may be alleged those passages in Clement of Alexandria, peculiarly startling to those whose views are framed upon the phraseology of modern theologians, wherein he speaks of the old Pagans being in a certain sense justified by philosophy¹; of its being necessary to them for righteousness before the coming of our LORD; of its constituting one out of many ways or gates of righteousness², whereby men, according to God's manifold goodness, might be and were variously led towards the royal way and gate. These and similar high expressions relate especially to the Platonic morals: although it is true that in his general commendations of philosophy he wished to be understood as adopting an eclectic process: "I mean not," says he, "the Stoical or the Platonic alone, nor yet that of Epicurus, nor of Aristotle; but whatsoever sayings may be found in each of those sects, rightly inculcating righteousness with religious consideration, those taken all together by way of selection I term philosophy³." This eclecticism may very well stand with an exclusive preference of Plato's doctrine, as to the unchangeable nature of moral good, arising out of the unchangeable attributes of God; a doctrine with which Clement every where in-

¹ Strom. i. 99; vi. 44.

² Ibid. i. 38; vi. 45.

³ Ibid. i. 73.

§ iv. 8. dicates his concurrence : *e. g.* where he calls Justice *natural*, and especially in that remarkable place which conveys his exposition of the critical word Justification¹ ; “ ‘ You have been justified,’ ” says the Apostle, “ ‘ in the name of the LORD ;’ you have been made by Him, so to speak, righteous, as He is righteous ; and in the greatest possible measure, according to your capacity, you have been blended and united with the HOLY SPIRIT of GOD.” This sentence clearly evinces, that when he spoke of philosophy justifying the heathen, he was far from any thought of its meriting for them, in the strict sense of the word, forgiveness of sins : he was speaking of inherent goodness, and that, he affirmed, philosophy gave them, so far as they may have really practised it, by the secret aid of God’s good SPIRIT, and so far as they may have become, accordingly, conformed to God’s image ; an idea which evidently applies to the Platonist alone, among heathen schools of morality.

Such is, what has sometimes been called in scorn, the Platonism of the early Church ; the allegation implied in that name being about as correct, as if one should say, the sun’s light was borrowed from the reflection of the moon in the water. The passages have been adduced, not to prove the fact, for that is allowed on all hands ; but as putting strongly before the mind the sort of view, which the ecclesiastical writers were likely to take of those narratives of Holy Writ, which we may call, in one sense, painfully perplexing. We see that they could not consistently explain them by any view, however enlarged, of expediency, a greater good resulting in the end ; they must either leave the several difficulties as they found them, or make them out in some way positively consistent with God’s eternal law.

(8.) We are far, however, from being left to antecedent probabilities on this head. St. Augustin, in his treatise against Faustus the Manichæan, has left us an elaborate statement of the principle on which, as he conceived, objections of the kind now in question are to be met, accompanied with many exemplifications. The Manichæans, as is well-known, affirmed the Old Testament to be the work of the Evil Principle ; and one of their main arguments was

¹ Strom. vii. 87.

grounded on the distressing parts of the Old Testament history. § iv. 8.
Indeed the similarity is wonderful between the blasphemies of Faustus, as they are recited by St. Augustin, and those of many modern unbelievers : whether the replies of St. Augustin agree as well with those most in favour among modern vindicators of Scripture, is another question ; of which more will be said presently.

He addresses himself to the inquiry with all the religious care, which might be expected from his deep reverence and affection for the Bible : stating himself, in the outset, to have in view the case, not so much of the Manichæans,—whose theology, as well as their moral conduct, proved that they could not adduce such objections in earnest,—as of others, who, without any vain teaching of their's, found in themselves disturbing thoughts, on comparing the life of the Prophets in the Old Testament with the life of the Apostles in the New. “ That we may not,” says he¹, “ proceed rashly in our moral judgment of these matters, we shall do well first to consider, what is sin : then to look into the deeds of the Saints registered in the divine books, that if in any instances we find even them to have sinned, we may ascertain, as diligently as we can, for what good end their sins also were set down and committed to memory. Next, in whatsoever cases we find what appears sin to the foolish or ill-disposed, not being such, yet not having in it any obvious example of goodness : we shall have to consider for what cause these things found a place in those Scriptures, which our faith tells us were written for our [soul's] health, to control us in this life, and obtain for us that which is to come. Lastly, whatsoever among the deeds of the Saints shine forth as lessons of righteousness, no man, even among the simple and ignorant, doubts the propriety of recording these. Of the two former classes, then, there may be a question ; first, those which may seem to be recorded idly, not having any goodness found in them, yet not being sins ; secondly, those, the relation of which may appear even pernicious, their sinfulness being undeniable, and they not unlikely to be drawn into precedent. In which latter kind again we may observe a further distinction. For some of these actions are uncensured in the Scripture itself, and

¹ Contr. Faust. lib. xxii. 26.

§ iv. 9, 10. may, therefore, by some be imagined no sin at all; others are indeed reprov'd in the Bible, yet may be committed with an hope of easy pardon, being such as are found even in those holy men."

(9.) A fairer or fuller statement of the case could hardly be given in the same number of words. Observe now how absolutely he lays down the doctrine of immutable morality, as the standard whereby to try the conduct of the Saints, no less than the ordinary conduct of ordinary men. "Sin¹," he proceeds, "is something done, said, or desired contrary to the eternal law. By the eternal law I mean the Divine reason or Will of God, commanding the preservation, forbidding the disturbance, of the natural order of things." Presently after he applies this standard to the several cases enumerated by Faustus, such as the polygamy of Abraham and Jacob; Abraham's conduct when with Sarah in Egypt; the histories of Lot, Judah, David, and others; the sanguinary wars and executions of Moses. And how uncompromising his casuistry was, we may see in the treatise *De Mendacio*: where he denies the lawfulness of any kind of lie, even for the saving of a man's life or soul, and maintains that all the cases alledged from the Old Testament in excuse or commendation of those who take such liberties, either had not the nature of lies, or are proposed as warnings, not as examples to mankind.

Such being in general the strictness of the Fathers' morality, it is nevertheless undeniable, that they treat the passages in question—St. Augustin himself, the asserter of a rule so inflexible, treats them—in a tone at which modern ears are apt to be startled: positively and unreservedly praising some things, which the men of this age either boldly censure, or condescendingly try to excuse, or at best shrink from discussing, as they would from the touch of a hot iron: and using much doubt and reserve in their censure of others, which to us are apt to seem clear and unquestionable cases of gross immorality.

(10.) Now with regard to the former class—the cases where the approbation of the Fathers is more positive than we should venture on,—it perhaps will be found that they generally spoke from

¹ Contr. Faust. xxii. 27.

a strong impression (which might or might not be well-grounded § iv. 10. in the particular case) that the person was acting by express command, or secret but sure inspiration, of ALMIGHTY GOD. The most signal instance of the kind is Abraham's sacrifice of his son: the command for which is too plainly set down in the Old Testament, and the praise of it in the New too marked and emphatical, to admit of its being called in question by any believer; but it is not always felt how far the principle of it extends:—that to it, as to the head of a class, may be referred very many of the passages which startle men, by representing God's favoured servants as acting with apparent cruelty and harshness. The Fathers deeply felt this: they felt that where God had plainly spoken, the justifications and arguments of men were out of place: nor did they doubt His having means to make His own voice so clear to His servants, that they need not fear its coming from any Spirit but His. And therefore St. Augustin, defending God's people against the charge of wronging the Egyptians, felt that he had said enough for them, if he brought them under the same category with Abraham: *i. e.* if he showed that they as well as Abraham had an express command from God. And this the very Manichæans must allow; for even Faustus, in general so unsparing, had not dared to insert the sacrifice of Isaac in his charges against the Patriarchs; probably because it would have been too offensive, so clear was the verdict of exceeding praise bestowed on that act in the New Testament. St. Augustin's reasoning is thus worded¹:—

“Some acts there are which the ETERNAL LORD . . . has set before men as in a kind of middle station, so that our taking them on ourselves would be justly blamed for presumption, but in fulfilling them, commanded, we earn the praise of obedience. So much difference does it make in the natural place and station of things, not only who is acting, and what is done, but also under whose authority. Abraham, had he sacrificed his son of his own accord, what would he have shown himself, but fearfully profane and detestable? What, when he did so at God's bidding, but full of all faith and devotion?” (Elsewhere², in comparing

¹ Contr. Faust. xxii. 73.² Quæst. in Jud. xlix. 4. t. iil. p. i. 456. D.

§ iv. 10. Abraham's act with Jephtha's, he had made this the leading difference: that the one, being bidden, offered his son; the other did what was forbidden by the law of Moses, and not enjoined on him by any special command.) . . . "Wherefore, if in the slaughter of a son the voluntary act would be accursed, but the dutiful obeying God's voice not only unblameable but glorious; why, O Faustus, blamest thou Moses, for having spoiled the Egyptians? If thine anger is moved by the apparent dishonesty, supposing the act human, let thy fear be also moved by the Divine authority of Him who enjoined it. Or, art thou prepared to blame God Himself for willing such things to be done? Then 'get thee behind me, Satan, for thou savourest not the things which be of God, but those which be of men.'"

He proceeds to apply the same principle to the wars of Moses and Joshua, and the destruction of the Canaanites¹—"The wars wrought by Moses we need not admire or shudder at, for in them he followed the Divine command: it was not cruelty, but obedience . . .² Why then rush we into daring reproaches, I would I could say, of men only, and not of God? What, if the ministers and dispensers of the Old Testament, who were also harbingers of the New, did their office by slaying sinners; while those ministers of the New, being also expositors of the Old, did theirs by dying under the hands of sinners? Yet both did their office to God—to Him who teaches that at divers but convenient seasons, from Him temporal goods must be sought, and for Him they are to be despised: by Him temporal chastisements are enjoined, and for Him they ought to be endured." So Theodoret, speaking of the slaughter of Agag by Samuel³: "He slew him as Phinehas did Zimri: for whatever God commands is religious." And Cyril, with no less simplicity and piety⁴: "We ought unhesitatingly, attributing rectitude to the verdict pronounced in Heaven, to keep ourselves from all thoughts of cavil, and hasten to accomplish what is bidden, though it be something not very agreeable to our own understandings. *E. g.* Saul spared Agag: . . . whereby he offends God, and that greatly; for he dealt gently

¹ Contr. Faust. xxii. 74.

² Ibid. § 79.

³ In 1 Reg. qu. 34. t. i. 379, ed. Schulze.

⁴ Comm. in Hos. t. iii. 13. C.

with him who was appointed to die ; his conduct being all one as if he had proclaimed in so many words, that God had passed an unjust sentence on Agag." § iv. 11.

(11.) To many persons, reading their Bibles with unprejudiced and simple minds, it may seem as if on this point we were multiplying unnecessary quotations. "Obey my voice," is to them, and they feel that it must ever have been to God's Saints, all in all, without further inquiry. But it seemed desirable to give full expression to the patristical view of cases like that of Abraham's sacrifice, for the sake of comparing it with a notion which seems to find favour with many in our days. Antiquity was content, when once it discerned a plain injunction from above : but the restless ingenuity of this age will not permit us heartily to acquiesce in the praises even of such as Abraham, except under cover of a certain theory of accommodation. Human sacrifices, we are told, and particularly the sacrifice of children by their parents, were notoriously practised by the nations of Canaan : God had not yet declared His abhorrence of such sacrifices : they were practised in that time and country as the most solemn rite of religion : therefore, whatever Abraham's feelings might be, his conscience was not startled at the command to offer his son—it was not yet an enlightened conscience—it partook of the barbarity of his time and country : allow for that, and Christians may contemplate the sacrifice of Isaac with edification, but without such allowance it will be a stumbling-block.

In like manner, the destruction of the Canaanites, the slaughter of the Midianitish women by Moses, of the Amalekites and Agag by Saul and Samuel, were not blameable in those times, because in those times "the laws of war, if so they may be called, were so thoroughly barbarous, that no amount of slaughter committed against enemies was likely to shock the feelings of any one." Samuel, in short, was a half-civilized person, and therefore might be justified in putting Agag to death, in obedience to the plain command of God ; but "to men in an advanced state of moral knowledge and feeling, the command to perpetrate such general slaughter . . . would be so revolting, that they could not and ought not to think that God could possibly be the author of it."

§ iv. 12, 13. (12.) Now, not to dwell here on the fact, that the iniquity of the Amorites, in Abraham's time, was declared to be not yet full, and that the book of Deuteronomy seems to speak of their burning their sons and their daughters in the fire to their gods, as the crowning act of that iniquity ; considerations which would seem to throw no small doubt on the statement that human sacrifices were usual in Canaan in Abraham's time ; neither would that doubt at once be removed by the mention of such sacrifices as practised by the Moabites many generations after :—not to insist on the remonstrance of Elisha, “ Wouldest thou destroy those whom thou hast made captive by thy sword and by thy bow?” as an indication that the then received “ laws of war” were not in all cases altogether so barbarous as the above argument requires :—omitting for the present objections of the historical sort, and only just noticing the obvious remark, that the higher and gentler a person's general tone of moral feeling, the less likely, one should think, would he be to be hurt and corrupted by a command to execute vengeance in some isolated case, however unsparingly ;—on granting which, the whole speculation vanishes :—passing over these and other considerations, the one thing now to be observed is, the striking contrast between the tone and manner of St. Augustin, and of the modern apology for the Bible : how completely the one mounts above, the other defers to, the natural cravings of a refined intellect after full satisfaction and explanation ; how fearlessly the one acquiesces in God's will, while the other would check us in such acquiescence, by philosophical calculations, of the result of such and such conduct on the tempers and character of the agent ; how the one in short walks entirely by faith, the other requires more or less of intellectual sight. On that one distinction we might perhaps reasonably join issue, which of the two schools may be more safely followed, as a guide through the difficulties of Scripture.

(13.) It will be said, perhaps, that the Fathers themselves have given their sanction to this principle of moral accommodation, pleading as they do for some of the Old Testament characters, the comparative imperfection of the light and strength which they enjoyed. But if we mark it well, we shall find this material difference between their accommodation, (if it may be so called.

and that which has been considered above,—that they never apply § iv. 13.
it to actions positively commanded or approved of God. It belongs either to *characters*, such as Rahab and the midwives of Egypt, who were on the whole praised and accepted, in spite of some immorality in the means they employed ; which immorality however was less in them than it would have been in us, on account of the greater imperfection of their knowledge :—or else it appertains to enactments or permissions, having in them more or less of a *ritual* and *positive*—one might almost say, of a *sacramental*—nature ; “ the custom of that time, when the promise was veiled, as distinguishable from the custom of this time, when the promise is revealed.” So writes St. Augustin¹, with a view especially to the domestic history of the Patriarchs. And perhaps we might refer to this head the whole subject of the law of marriage, both before and after the time of Moses, as compared with that which had existed in Paradise, and which our SAVIOUR renewed in the Christian Church.

Of this latter class St. Irenæus is speaking, where, having quoted St. Paul's permissive sentences in 1 Cor. vii. he infers², “ If even in the New Testament we find the Apostles allowing some precepts on a principle of condescension, because of the incontinence of certain persons, lest such, becoming obdurate and altogether despairing of their salvation, fall entirely away from God ; it is no wonder, should the same God in the Old Testament also have willed something of the kind, alluring His people for their good by the aforesaid observances, whereby they might at least learn to keep the Ten Commandments, and feel them such a check as should prevent their turning to idolatry, and becoming apostates from God ; nay, and whereby they might learn to love Him with their whole heart.” Thus Irenæus, to explain how the Mosaical permission of divorce might harmonize with the purer Evangelical Law, coming in its season. It was matter of *permission*, not of *commandment* ; as our LORD Himself hinted to the Pharisees, when they pressed Him with it. For they having asked, “ Why did Moses *command* divorce ?” He in His reply corrected

¹ Contr. Faust. xxii. 23.

² Lib. iv. 29.

§ iv. 14. the expression ; “ Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, *suffered*” (not *enjoined*) “ you to put away your wives : but from the beginning it was not so.”

(14.) For an illustration of the other kind of moral accommodation, we may refer to St. Augustin, *de Mendacio*¹. “ Whereas it is written, that God dealt bountifully with the Hebrew midwives, and with Rahab, the harlot of Jericho ; that was not because of the falsehoods they uttered, but because of the kindness they showed to the people of God. It was not then their deceit which received a reward, but their good and dutiful affection. . . . For as it would not appear strange nor unreasonable, should God in consideration of their later good works be willing to forgive certain evil works formerly committed by them ; so neither is it any thing wonderful, if God at one time and in one transaction beholding both,—a deed of mercy and one of deceit,—did not only reward the one as good, but also with a view to that goodness did forgive the other which was evil. . . . We may understand then that to those women, to the one in Egypt, to the other in Jericho, was rendered according to their humanity and mercy a reward, of this world indeed, but such as might also in prophetic shadow represent, unknown to themselves, something eternal. But whether at any time it be right to tell a lie, even for the sake of saving a man ; this being a question, the solution of which even the most learned find a weary task, was of course far beyond the compass of ordinary women, dwelling where they did, and with the tone of morals they were used to. Accordingly, this ignorance of theirs, as also their equal blindness in many other things, things which are reserved to be known by the children not of this world but of the next ; this ignorance, I say, the long suffering of God endured. . . . As to Rahab, when she did that deed,—good and laudable, considering her state of life,—she was not yet such as that one should require of her, ‘ Let your conversation be, Yea, yea, Nay, nay.’ But we, in our inquiries whether any kind of lie can ever suit a good man, have an eye to the case not of an Egyptian, not of one appertaining to

¹ § 32. t. vii. p. 341. E.

Jericho or Babylon, nor of one who is still a denizen of the earthly Jerusalem, which is in bondage with her children; but of a citizen of that city which is above, our mother eternal in the heavens," § iv. 15.

(15.) Hitherto those cases only have been considered, in which the approbation of Holy Writ is express; let us now proceed to those which may seem to be left doubtful, being simply recorded, with no clear precept or commendation. And here it will be obvious to the most cursory examiner, that amidst great individual diversity, the Fathers, as a body, in discussing such cases, almost always lean to the favourable side. They do so in a degree, which to persons with mere modern associations may often appear extravagant, sometimes even shocking. In this they might be suspected of merely indulging, perhaps unknown to themselves, the very natural wish, of being always on the side, as it were, of those whom they believed and knew for certain to be on God's side. One might be tempted to allow a good deal for such partiality, were it not that the Fathers have themselves explained, fully and frankly, the principles on which they so acted. Those principles are mainly two: the one, a hearty sense of the Communion of Saints, as a still subsisting bond of union between them and the Patriarchal and Mosaical ages; the other (which shall be first exemplified) a deep and reverential sense of God's peculiar Presence and Interference through the whole of this history; a trembling consciousness that they were near the invisible line which separates His agency from that of His rational creatures; which thought, wherever it becomes habitual, will necessarily make a religious man slow to censure, lest he be found blaming his Maker's work unawares. This is the account of those passages of the Fathers, in which, considering the mystical meaning as undoubted, they seem to allege it as stopping the mouths of gainsayers. To do any thing like justice to their view, we must copy the acute reasoning of St. Augustin himself¹.

"I lay down this first of all, that not only the tongues of those

¹ Contr. Faust. xxii. 24.

§ iv. 15. men, but their very lives also, were prophetic; that the whole kingdom of the Hebrews was as it were a great prophet, great because He is great who was the subject of the prophecy. Wherefore in regard of those among them, whose hearts were trained in the wisdom of God, we must look for prophecies of the CHRIST who should come, and of His Church, not only in what they said, but also in what they did; in regard of other individuals, and of the whole nation collectively, the field of prophecy lies rather in what God did with them and for them. For all 'these things,' as the Apostle says, 'were our ensamples,' our types or figures.

"And whereas the Manichæans in certain actions, the depth of which they are far from comprehending, blame what they call the sensuality of the prophets; this is no more than parallel to the reproaches which are cast by certain sacrilegious heathens on our LORD Himself, for folly, or rather for madness, in seeking fruit on a tree at an unseasonable time of year, or for a sort of childish simplicity, in stooping His head and writing on the ground, and after His answer to certain questions beginning to do the same again. For why? they have no wisdom, no sense to perceive that in great souls certain excellences resemble certain blemishes in the mean and worthless; there is some slight show, but no real fairness, in the comparison. And they who find such fault with the nobler sort are like untutored boys in school, who having learned for a great discovery that singular nouns require singular verbs, criticise the most skilful of Latin authors for the phrase, '*Pars in frusta secant.*' 'For,' say they, 'he should have written *secat.*'

"On which one might perhaps without absurdity remark, that the verbal turns and figures of learned men are not further distant in their kind from the ungrammatical and barbarous phraseology of the ignorant, than are the figurative deeds of the Prophets from the sensual enormities of bad men. By which rule, as a boy, who should plead Virgil's figure by way of excuse for bad grammar, would be presently beaten with rods; so should any person guilty of adultery with his servant plead Abraham's example, who raised up seed of Hagar, good were it for that man to meet with some severer chastisement, and not

to be eternally punished with other adulterers. I grant that of § iv. 16. these comparisons one side are the merest trifles, the other side truly great; neither does our analogy tend to such a thing as making a grammatical figure as important as a mystery, a solecism equally culpable with an act of adultery; only, by proportion, in their several kinds, what skill and ignorance are in the virtues and vices (so to call them) of language, that, although in a widely different kind, are wisdom and folly in those moral virtues and vices."

(16.) St. Irenæus more briefly had taught the same doctrine long before, vindicating the harmony of the two Testaments against the Gnostics, who were in fact but an earlier development of the Manichæan school. "The great Revealer¹," says he, "is the SON of the FATHER, as being from the beginning with the FATHER. By Him accordingly prophetic visions, and differences of gifts, His own ministeries and the FATHER's glory, have been manifested to the race of man, in a certain train and regular system, at such time as was expedient. For where things follow each other in order, there is consistency and harmony; and where there is harmony, there each thing is suited to the time; and where there is such suitableness, there is true expediency." (This is the same principle as was before observed on in Augustin, that God's eternal law measures alike all dispensations, but that part of that law is a certain equitable consideration of circumstances; and so far Irenæus too admits a kind of accommodation or moral economy.) He goes on. "For this cause the WORD became Dispenser, Steward, Distributer of the FATHER's grace, according to the needs of mankind, for whose sake He contrived so vast arrangements." He proceeds to explain, that one of these arrangements or providences was, for the prophets of old time, announcing as they did the future vision of Almighty God, to see Him, see both the FATHER and the SON, not properly, but "so far as might practise and mould men's thoughts to receive that glory, which is hereafter to be revealed to all who love God. For not by discourse alone did the Fathers prophesy, but also by vision, and conversation, and acts which they wrought,

¹ Lib. iv. § 37, p. 333, lin. 32. ed. Grabe.

§ iv. 17. after the suggestion of the SPIRIT. In this sense then they beheld the invisible God : . . . in this sense again they beheld the Son of God, who is Man, conversing with men ; . . . and the several progressive portions of that work by which He sums up all, they partly beheld in vision, declared partly in words, and partly signified as in type by action ; with their eyes beholding what God would have seen, by their discourse proclaiming what He would have heard, by their acts fulfilling what He would have done ; in all, as prophets delivering their message."

(17.) The instance of revelation by action, which Irenæus selects, is the marriage of the prophet Hosea, one of the cases on which the adversaries had taken occasion to speak reproachfully'. "CHRIST showed Himself to the prophets in their typical actions, so as by them to prefigure and show forth things to come. Thus the prophet Hosea took to him 'a wife of whoredoms;' by that act prophesying that the earth should commit great whoredom, departing from the LORD; meaning the men who are on the earth; and that out of such men God would be well pleased to take to Himself a Church, to be sanctified by participation of His Son, as she was sanctified by communion with the prophet."

That which Scripture here affirms of the marriage of Hosea, viz., both its mystical purport, and its having been contracted by Divine order, the Fathers consider to be implied generally in the histories of the marriages of Prophets and Patriarchs ; and surely they had warrant for their opinion, in St. Paul's commentary on the narrative concerning Abraham and Hagar, which is quoted by Origen (amongst others) for this argument²: "That the Scriptural histories of brides and handmaids should be referred to the mystical meaning, is no doctrine of ours, but received of wise teachers from the beginning ; one of whom thus expressed himself, awakening the hearer's mind to the mystical sense, 'Tell me, ye that desire,' " &c., (quoting the whole passage :) and then he subjoins : "Whoever will take up the Epistle to the Galatians will know how the allegory is employed in what relates to the marriages [of the Patriarchs] and their unions with their handmaids ; not as though it were the purport of God's Word.

¹ Iren. iv. 37, p. 396. 26.

² Contr. Cel. iv. 43. t. i. p. 537. C.

that we should imitate those who did so, in their external and § iv. 18.
bodily actions, but (as the disciples of Jesus use to call it) in
their spiritual ones."

(18.) These remarks of some of the most considerable Fathers may serve perhaps both to explain and vindicate the judgment of the ancient Church on certain parts of the sacred history. The result of their rule is, that whenever an action startling to our moral sense is recorded of any of the holy men of old, more especially when it is accompanied with circumstances which mark it out clearly as a Mystery or Sacrament of religion, (the term Sacrament is used as commonly applied in Antiquity,) in such instances, (Scripture being silent as to the moral nature of the action), we cannot be sure that it was not either expressly commanded, like the sacrifice of Abraham, or at least prompted by inspiration of the HOLY GHOST. It becomes us therefore not to criticise, but to adore.

This idea in various degrees pervades the reflections of the Fathers on the case of Rebecca and Jacob, coming by subtlety, and taking away what Esau supposed to be his blessing. One writer indeed, St. Gregory Nazianzen, has spoken of it in terms of censure. He having somewhere occasion to magnify the value of a parent's blessing, observes that¹ "one of the elder saints thought it worth obtaining even by stealth, deceiving his father by meat and the contrivance of a hairy garment: he pursued a noble object by ignoble means."

But besides St. Gregory, it does not appear that any of the early Christian writers hesitated to consider the transaction in the same light, wherein it is represented by St. Augustin in the following passage²: "That which Jacob did by direction of his mother, so as to appear to deceive his father, if you consider diligently and faithfully, *non est mendacium sed mysterium*. Which sort of thing, if we term it a lie, by the same rule all parables and figures must be also accounted lies. . . . But if we are not prepared to call it lying, whensoever words signifying one thing through another are employed to communicate any truth; it is clear that

¹ Apol. p. 40. D. t. i; Paris, 1600.

² Contr. Mendac. ad Consent. c. 24, t. vi. 337. D.

§ iv. 18. not only what Jacob said and did to obtain his father's blessing, but also the discourse of Joseph, whereby he seemed to beguile his brethren, and David's feigning madness, and other things of that kind, ought to be acquitted of the guilt of lying, and rather to be esteemed prophetic words and actions, to be referred [exclusively] to the truths which we were meant to understand by them." He regards the whole as a sort of scenery, (if the expression may be reverently used) not only excusable but praiseworthy in Rebecca, as being undertaken on intimation of God's will.

St. Ambrose says ¹, "Rebecca for her part did not so much prefer one son to another, as the righteous to the unrighteous. For in the mind of that pious mother the mystery overweighed the tie of affection. She was not so much preferring Jacob to his brother, as offering him to the LORD, who, she knew, had power to preserve the gift presented unto him." (This seems to mean that in consecrating Jacob to be the first born, she knowingly separated him from herself, and so made a great sacrifice.) "Hereby," adds Ambrose, "she provided also for Esau, withdrawing him as she did from the Divine displeasure, lest he should be involved in deeper guilt, by losing the grace of the benediction once received."

These words mark strongly St. Ambrose's sense of what we should call the *sacramental* nature of the transaction. In substance, that view is sanctioned also by St. Chrysostom ². "Rebecca," he says, "did this not of her own mind, but in obedience to the divine oracle. What then? a man may say, did God co-operate with such a falsehood? Nay, my brother, consider not simply what was done, but look to the purpose: that he did it not for any kind of worldly advantage, but sought to attract to himself his father's blessing. If we are always to look simply to the deed done, and not in every case to regard also the end, we shall have for the next thing to call Abraham an infanticide, and Phinehas a murderer. But not so . . . for each of them was accomplishing a Divine decree. . . . Still more in this case your

¹ De Jacob et vita beata, II. 6.; t. I. 546.

² In Gen. Hom. 43; t. i. 415. 7. ed. Savil.

thoughts are not to dwell on the words of Jacob being formally a falsehood, but you are to understand that God, willing to bring His prediction to accomplishment, caused the whole so to take place by way of economy." So far St. Chrysostom, who proceeds to point out God's hand in many minute details of the transaction, such as Isaac's doubts being overruled; the special circumstance of his kissing Jacob, and limiting the blessing to him whom he kissed, as by a kind of sacramental sign; and Esau's not returning from the field until the economy was complete. § iv. 18.

St. Chrysostom, we see, dwells chiefly on the marks of providential interference in the literal transaction: others have brought out in a strong light the allegorical force of the things then said and done, from hints given incidentally in other parts of the Bible. Thus St. Ambrose¹, not indulging his own fancy, but following the tradition of an elder age of the Church: as appears plainly by St. Jerome's report of the commentary of Hippolytus² on this chapter of Genesis: "Jacob went to the flock, and brought for his father the offspring of innocency, or the gifts of sacred prophecy, because to the patriarch no food he knew could be more welcome than that CHRIST, who was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and as a lamb to the sacrifice. . . . The robe which he wore Rebecca brought out, in her character as prefiguring the Church, and assigned to her younger son the robe of the Old Testament, the prophetic and sacerdotal robe, that royal robe of David, the robe of the kings, Solomon, Hezekiah, Josiah; she brought out and gave it to the Christian people, which would know how to use the favour received. For the Jewish people had it without use, and knew not of their own rich apparel. This robe was lying in the dimness, cast away and neglected. For it was obscured by the dark gloom of irreligion, and in the narrow heart of the Jewish people it could not be spread out wider. CHRIST's nation put it on, and it shone forth; illumined by the brightness of their faith and the light of their pious acts. Isaac recognised the order of his race, he knew the robe of the elder Scripture, but the voice of the elder people he

¹ De Jacob, &c., II. 9; t. i. 548.

² Ap. Galland. Bibl. Patr. t. ii. 486. B.

§ iv. 19. did not recognise; and thereby he gathered that there was a change [of people.] For to this day the same robe remains, but a devouter nation hath arisen, and a confession clear and melodious; well therefore said he, 'The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau.'

Augustine¹ adds the selection of the two kids; "He bears the sins of others, and he bears them patiently, though they belong to others: for thus it is to wear the skins of the kids; the kids being the scriptural symbol of the two sinful people;" (and therefore one of the appointed sin offerings;) "and Jacob wearing them to represent both CHRIST and His Church in that particular, the bearing of other men's burthens."

He dwells also² much on Jacob's being declared just before to be a man without guile, "*ἀπλαστός*"; a significant expression, leading one to infer that the subtlety so soon afterwards imputed to him was not subtlety in a bad sense: it was a figure of speech, as when CHRIST is called a Rock: it was no real fraud, especially as Jacob might truly say to his father, that for the purpose in question he was his elder son Esau; for Esau had before that made the agreement, sold his birthright, and put Jacob in his own place.

Again³, there is the conduct of Isaac; instead of being angry, he trembled very exceedingly; or as in the LXX. *ἐξίστη ἐκστασιν μεγάλην σφόδρα*: which kind of extasy, commonly happening in the revelation of great things, we are to understand that God gave him warning in his spirit to confirm the blessing to his younger son, who otherwise should have incurred anger by deceiving his father.

Again⁴, he kissed Jacob before he blessed him, and not Esau: confirming peace to the one and not to the other.

(19.) These are the kind of circumstances, which, to the Fathers' view, betokened the special agency of the MOST HIGH in proceedings otherwise questionable, and which, as they thought, ought to turn censure into reverence. It will be seen that they are reducible to three heads: first, approbation of analogous

¹ Serm. iv. § 16; t. v. 13. D.

² Ibid. § 21.

³ Ibid. § 15— 2, 23.

⁴ Ibid. § 24.

conduct in Scripture itself, such as Origen produces in the case of § iv. 19, 20. Hagar ; secondly, tokens of special providence in the particular transaction, such as occurred to Chrysostom in the history of Jacob ; thirdly, the use of known symbolical imagery, as marking intended adaptation to the Christian mysteries ; which head, as we have seen, may be largely illustrated from Augustin and Ambrose on the same case.

It may be added, that they regarded themselves as especially bound to notice every thing of this kind,—to be more than commonly afraid to censure,—in treating of the lives of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. On passing from their history to that of others, Augustin, it will be found, changes his tone, so far as to be less positive in his vindications where the Scripture is silent. The reason is implied in the sentence which forms the transition ¹. “ Thus much concerning the three fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whose God He willed Himself to be called, Who is our God, Whom the Catholic Church worships.” The Church had learned from the beginning to regard them as the chosen representatives of the Head CHRIST JESUS, and of the Body, the Church. God was not ashamed to be called their God ; they were in a peculiar sense the types of His chosen, His saints ; it was wise therefore, and safe, and dutiful, to hold them in especial reverence. With this view ² Irenæus, *e. g.*, has expounded the whole history of Jacob ; of that one among the three, whose right to such honour the disputers of this world would be most apt to question.

(20.) In other cases, as might be expected, their scrupulousness and reverence were mainly in proportion to their sense of the mystical meaning. Thus where it is written of Noah, *ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐμεθυσθη, καὶ ἐγυμνάθη, ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ*, they had no thoughts other than those of deepest reverence, considering not only what is so obvious, that the whole was involuntary through ignorance on the Patriarch's part, on which many of them argue largely ³ ; but also that which St. Cyprian writes, not in the tone of an ingenious inventor, but of one who had

¹ Contr. Faust. xxii. c. 59.

² Lib. iv. c. 38.

³ E. G. S. Chrys. in Gen. Hom. 29, t. i. 226. ed. Savil.

§ iv. 21. received it from tradition ecclesiastical¹. "We find, in Genesis, in the case of Noah, an image of our Lord's Passion: that he drank of the wine, that he was drunken; that he was naked in his own house; that he lay with his limbs bare and extended; that the nakedness was pointed out by his second son, and reported abroad, but covered by the other two, the elder and the younger: and other particulars not to our present purpose."

With the case of Lot and his daughters, as might be expected, they deal in a much more doubtful tone; assigning as one reason the comparative imperfection of his character, and intimating a doubt (at least such is Origen's view²) whether this can fairly be reckoned among those narratives which prefigure Christ's sacred economy. At the same time they are exact in pointing out the probability (to which the air of the narrative certainly would lead us) that the women acted under the supposition of the whole world besides themselves and their father having been destroyed by the fire and brimstone. "They suspected," says Origen³, "that some such thing had happened as they had heard of in the days of Noah, and they alone with their father were left for the renovation of the human race."

(21.) This interpretation (in which many of the old writers⁴ agree), while it shows that they, contrary to some people's statements, used their common sense in applying to the sacred history the ordinary distinctions and measures of right and wrong, exhibits also a clear instance of that other characteristic, which, as was before said, causes them in all their discussions to take the favourable side, to a degree which to many moderns has appeared extravagant:—their deep sense of the Communion of Saints, as a relation really subsisting between them and the Patriarchs and Prophets, and not merely as a figure of speech. It should seem as if this feeling were the natural growth of the other, viz., of the reverential consciousness of God's own immediate presence, overruling the Patriarchs' conduct in such a way, as to make the

¹ Ep. 63. ed. Fell. p. 149.

² Contr. Cels. iv. 45; in Gen. Hom. V. 5.

³ In Gen. Hom. V. § 4. 5.

⁴ S. Aug. contr. Faust. xxii. 43; S. Iren. iv. 51; S. Ambr. de Abrah. i. 56.

whole a series of links, binding the old dispensations to the new. § iv. 22. Those who really contemplated the matter so, must have looked on Noah, Abraham, Jacob, and the rest, as sharers with them in the same Sacraments; not only as spiritual Fathers by the example of their faith, but also (since CHRIST's coming) as brethren in His grace. The duty therefore of lenity of supposition, the command to impute no evil, would hold in their case with peculiar force; becoming as it did the more affecting, by the sense that it was demanded not for the living but for the dead; and the more serious and awful, by the knowledge, that for ought they could tell, God's own hand and counsel might be more or less in the things which they were blaming.

(22.) For these reasons we find the Fathers constantly, even where the Mystical meaning was entirely concealed from them, or where they gave it no direct consideration—we find them checking to the utmost all inclination to censure the holy men of old without express authority. The principle is laid down by Irenæus, in words the more worthy of every believer's attention, in that he utters them not as his own, but as the words of a certain Presbyter, who had heard them from the eye-witnesses and scholars of the Apostles. Irenæus, having stated it as one of the marks of a sound teacher, that “he expounds the Scriptures to us without peril, neither blaspheming God, nor dishonouring Patriarchs, nor despising Prophets,” goes on to record the following, as an apostolical tradition¹: “That for the old Fathers, concerning those things which they wrought without the counsel of the SPIRIT, that censure is sufficient which the Scripture itself contains. God is no respecter of persons:—to things not done according to His will, He himself annexed that censure which was convenient.” He instances at large in the cases of David and Solomon, concerning whom, he adds², “the aforesaid Presbyter affirmed that the rebuke of Holy Writ was sufficient; that no flesh might glory in the presence of the LORD.”

The next sentence, whatever some may think of the statement contained in it, is at least a mark of the ancient Church's anxiety to assert for the Patriarchs, as was just now observed, a part in the

¹ Lib. iv. 45. p. 345. ed. Grab.

² Ibid. p. 346.

§ iv. 22. Communion of Saints. “For this cause, that ancient Presbyter went on to say, the LORD descended to the regions under the earth, declaring to them also the good tidings of His advent ; remission of sins being appointed for them only who believe. Now those believed in Him, whosoever were before hoping in Him, i. e. those who foretold His coming, and did the work of His mysterious providences, righteous men, and Prophets, and Patriarchs. Their sins He forgave as he did ours : which sins, therefore, it becomes us not any more to lay to their charge ; except we think scorn of the grace of God. . . . For all men need the glory of God, and are justified not of themselves but by the coming of the LORD : those I mean who look steadily on His light.

“He taught moreover that their acts were written for our reproof, that we might know this first, that there is one God, both ours and theirs, whom sins cannot please, though wrought by renowned persons. Next, that we might keep ourselves from evil things. For if those elders who went before us in God’s special graces, for whom the Son of God had not yet suffered, were visited with such disgrace, if they transgressed in some one thing, and became slaves to fleshly concupiscence ; what shall this generation suffer, as many as have despised the coming of the LORD, and turned utter slaves to their own pleasures ! . . . ‘We ought not then’, said that Presbyter, ‘to be proud, nor to reproach the ancients, but ourselves to fear, lest haply after the knowledge of CHRIST, if we do any thing which pleases not God, we no longer have remission of our sins, but find ourselves shut out of His kingdom.’”

A little farther on¹ he produces the authority of the same Presbyter for this sentiment : “As on account of those sins which the Scriptures themselves lay to the charge of the Patriarchs and Prophets, we are not to reproach them, nor become like Ham, who derided his father’s shame and fell under the curse ; but rather to thank God for them, that their sins were forgiven them in the coming of our LORD : even as they, he said, give thanks, and are glorified in our salvation :—So concerning those deeds which the Scriptures reprove not at all, but simply relate them, we ought not, he said,

¹ Lib. iv. cap. 50.

to become accusers; (for we are not more exact than God, § iv. 22, neither can we be above our Master) but we ought to look out for the spiritual meaning. For whatsoever things are set down in the Scriptures without censure, not one of them is idly set down, nor without meaning."

And then¹ he gives the example of Lot and his daughters, adopting (it is not Irenæus, observe, but the apostolical Presbyter) that interpretation which Origen, as we have seen, doubted of as too favourable. A thing much to be remarked by those, who think little of the Mystical method, as supposing it a figment of Platonism, or a contrivance of a later school in the Church.

A signal example of the mildness above inculcated had been given by the same Irenæus a little before², in arguing against Tatian, who denied the possibility of Adam's salvation. He contrasts Adam's proceedings even after his fall with those of the Evil Spirit, and says, "It was another who seduced him under pretence of immortality: and being seduced, he presently fears, and hides himself; not as though he could escape God, but in his confusion, because having transgressed His command, he is unworthy to come to the sight or speech of God. Now the fear of the LORD is the beginning of understanding: the understanding of sin causes penitence: and to the penitent God vouchsafes His mercy. Moreover, by his girdle or apron he manifested his penitence in the way of significant action: . . . as though he had said, 'By disobedience I have lost that robe of holiness which I had from the HOLY SPIRIT: I now acknowledge that I deserve that sort of vesture, which can give no pleasure, but galls and vexes the body.' And this dress evidently he would always have worn, humbling himself, had not God who is merciful clothed them with coats of skins instead of the fig-leaves."

Another case very much in point is their view of the conduct of Abraham in Egypt, making known Sarah as his sister, not as his wife: it was no falsehood, as he himself explained afterwards, and, that there was in it no unfaithful timidity, Augustin³ argues on this ground: that "it is a sound precept, when a man has

¹ Cap. 51.

² Lib. iii. 37.

³ Contr. Faust. lib. xxii. 36.

§ iv. 23. any resource, not to tempt the LORD his God : and that our SAVIOUR Himself set an example to that purpose, both by flying into Egypt in his childhood, and by going up to a certain feast not openly but as it were in secret. . . . So Abraham among strangers, because of the exceeding beauty of Sarah finding himself in a double danger, both of her honour and her husband's life, and not being able to protect both, but having it in his power to do something for one of the two, *i. e.* his own life ; that he might not tempt his God, he took what precaution he could ; and where he could do nothing, that cause he committed to his God."

One may observe in passing, that the suspicion of any particular want of faith in Abraham on that occasion is greatly lessened by what he afterwards told Abimelech¹: that the concealment of his marriage was not a measure to which they were driven by the present alarm, but one which they had constantly used by way of precaution since they first set out on their pilgrimage.

(23.) Elsewhere the rule of favourable construction is applied, where the act is allowed to be censurable, with a view to mitigation, not entire acquittal. Thus Aaron is conjectured by Augustin² to have proposed to the Israelites the breaking off their ear-rings, with a view to withdraw them by the hardness of the command from their idolatrous intention. Thus Theodoret³, relating the oversight of Moses in striking the rock, insists carefully on the many circumstances which might seem according to human measures to render an expression of impatience for the moment completely venial. "They (Moses and Aaron) being out of heart at their sister's death, the people set on them, mutinying for want of water ; they, therefore, impatient at such extreme unruliness, used words of equivocal meaning on bringing out the water, 'Must we fetch you water out of this rock ?' in a tone as if he doubted, so great was his wrath with them. It was, however, a doubt not of the soul but of the lips only : for so the

¹ Gen. xx. 13.

² Quæst. in Exod. 141. t. 3. pars i. 347 : comp. Theodoret on Exod. qu. 66. t. i. 170.

³ In Num. qu. 37. t. i. 245.

Greek Bible expresses it, *δέσπειλεν*, he made a distinction, or hesitated, with his lips." "However," adds Theodoret, "we must not forget that God pronounced this sentence (of exclusion from the promised land) with a view to another dispensation which He was carrying on." Here we see plainly the studious apologist: yet who can deny that the tone is right and scriptural? § iv. 24.

(24.) The same lenity of supposition is sometimes extended to the conduct of persons, concerning whose general character Scripture is either silent, or at first sight might appear condemnatory. Thus of Rachel stealing her father's images, Theodoret writes¹, "Some say, Rachel stole them out of an affection she still entertained for them; I, quite on the contrary, suppose that, desiring to free her father from superstition, she did, as it were, make prize of them: for of her general piety we are certified by the divine Scripture." Having confirmed this by several texts, he proceeds to suggest a prophetic meaning. Jacob was a type of the Lord of all: for, as God had two peoples,—the elder, having a veil upon its heart, the younger, endowed with the beauty of faith; even so Jacob, two wives, Leah, tender eyed, Rachel, beautiful and well-favoured; the elder with many children, the younger barren: for the Church also of the Gentiles of old was barren, but became afterwards very fruitful. . . . Since then, the Church, upon faith in God our Saviour, pulled up by the roots the error of her forefathers, Rachel, being a type of that Church, stole the idols of her father, that herein also she might offer a dim shadow of the truth." Here one is tempted to remark, how much we may lose by the cold and dry way, in which we are apt to read the sacred history, as mere matter of criticism, historical, or moral, contrasted with the high and thrilling views, wherewith the ecclesiastical rules of interpretation reward those who fairly adopt them.

Other instances of the like lenity, applied even to persons more clearly in the wrong, may be found in Theodoret² on the histories of Thamar, the daughter-in-law of Judah, and of the Bethel³

¹ In Gen. qu. 90. t. i. p. 98.

² Ibid. qu. 96. p. 103.

³ In 3 Reg. qu. 43. t. i. 487—490.

§ iv. 25, 26. Prophet, whose advice caused the death of the messenger sent to Jeroboam.

(25.) *A fortiori*, one should expect the like mildness in the comments of Antiquity on the New Testament. One instance may be here given, because it relates to a matter which is and has been much misinterpreted: St. Paul's condescension in the matter of certain Jewish observances. "God forbid," exclaims St. Augustin¹, "that we should account him to have done this deceitfully. For on this subject his sentence is well known; that neither such Jews as then believed in CHRIST should be forbidden the traditions of their fathers, nor the Gentiles, on becoming Christians, be forced to observe the same: lest on the one hand those holy mysteries, which were known to rest on the Divine command, should come to be shunned as profanations,—on the other, to be accounted necessary to salvation for all who turned to God under the New Testament. . . . St. Paul's saying, therefore, 'I am made all things to all men,' tells us what he did in the way of sympathy, not in the way of deceitful accommodation. . . . He is made as a Jew to the Jews, not by deceiving them, but by putting himself, in thought, in their place and mind."

(26.) Thus far by way of illustration of the two chief principles, by which antiquity seems to have been guided, in commenting on the startling and painful portions of the history of God's ancient people. One more general observation remains: it is a negative statement, and requires a much larger induction than at present it professes to rest upon; but it is submitted to the judgment of those who are really versed in ancient theology, Whether the Fathers do in any case plead the Mystical meaning of a transaction as any excuse for it, granting it indeed immoral. The Mystery comes in, to show that God's hand was in what took place, and often, among other circumstances, may lead to the supposition of an express command from God, and so may indirectly tend to do away with the immorality: but the whole tone of their commentaries indicates, and sometimes they ex-

¹ Contra Mendac. ad Consent. § 26. t. vi. 339: compare his correspondence with St. Jerome. t. ii. 64, 131, 148, &c.

pressly disavow, any thought of palliating guilt by the simple fact of the action being afterwards found typical. Thus St. Augustin¹, examining in order the cavils of the Manichæans, against one narrative after another, premises in every case his literal defence or explanation, before he touches the sacramental or mysterious meaning. Thus Theodoret², although as firmly as any one adhering to the mystical mode of exposition, advances in mitigation those circumstances only, which may be gathered from the letter, in such histories as those of Noah, Lot, and Thamar. Thus even St. Ambrose, who seems to have been most passionately carried away by his admiration of the elder saints, and most afraid to exercise any judgment of his own upon their conduct—and who in his second *Apology* for David, to which may be added some expressions about the incest of Judah, comes, perhaps, as near as any writer to a questionable plea from the mystical interpretation, as though it in some degree palliated the sin,—even he, we shall find, does not enter on the consideration of the *Mystery* at all, before he has used considerations drawn from the literal history to adjust the degree of censure required by the case³.

(27.) If we pass from these indications of caution, to express disavowals by the Fathers of immoral use of the mystical principle, we meet with one in St. Ambrose himself⁴, remarking on the conduct of Aaron, in assisting the Israelites to make an idol. "That renowned High Priest we can neither acquit, nor yet dare we altogether condemn him. However, he was not without a special meaning in taking away the rings and jewels of the Jews; for they who were plotting sacrilege could not have the seal of faith."

Thus St. Ambrose: and his scholar St. Augustin repeats the same caution many times. For example⁵, "The conduct of Lot and his daughters we do not justify, on the ground of its having had a meaning, whereby it foretold the perverseness of some in future times. Their purpose in so acting was one, God's purpose in permitting such actions, with a view to certain

¹ Contr. Faust. l. xxii.

² In Gen. qu. 56, 70, 95.

³ T. i. 823, &c.

⁴ Ep. 68.

⁵ Contr. Faust. xxii. 41. t. vi. 273.

§ iv. 28. typical instruction, another ; His just judgment abiding the while on the sin of the persons then living, and His providence watchfully securing the mystical representation of others to come long after. The deed then related in Holy Scripture is a prophecy ; considered in their conduct who performed it, it is a crime."

Again, in speaking of the incest of the patriarch Judah : the truth of the spiritual meaning, he says, and the criminality of the act, may well stand together¹. "The conduct of Judah, in regard of his unbridled passion, was evil, but without his knowledge it presignified an exceeding good : and let this caution stand for all other evil deeds of men, whereby He who records their history hath seen fit to prophesy good to us."

(28.) It is not of course pretended that the Fathers acted in all cases up to their own rule : so many of them, writing so miscellaneously, all of like passions with us. But it is believed that the rules above illustrated will go a good way towards explaining the difference between their theology and ours, in what may be called the casuistry of the historical Scriptures. And we, perhaps, should read Bible history to more advantage, if we tried to keep the same principles in view ; the principle, namely, of reverencing throughout the mysterious connexion of that history, even the most startling portions of it, with the Economy of our Salvation by the Son of God : and the principle of entire respect for the Saints of the Old Covenant ; fearing to censure them where Scripture is silent ; welcoming all reasonable topics of mitigation even where they are clearly blameable ; never rudely sitting in judgment on them, but looking up to them as to elder brethren, who might of course err, but whom it is no part of ours to reprove, feeling as we must in every part of their history, read by the light of Christian faith, that we are even now with them in the more immediate presence of our common LORD and FATHER.

It may be, that thus our notions may remain unsettled, on many actions recorded in the Bible ; of which we would gladly know what to think, both for our own and other men's satisfaction. What then ? it is one of the tokens of true theology, to acknow-

¹ Contr. Faust. § 82. p. 292, 3.

ledge doubtfulness and perplexity, more or less, in every subject. § iv. 28.
A religious man would not think himself at liberty to question God's moral government, because of the embarrassment continually occasioned by the inconsistencies of the good, and the general difficulty of discerning men's real character; how then dare any one positively insist on full satisfaction in his view of the conduct of God's Saints? As it is, the doubtfulness of many things has this advantage, sufficient to outweigh much annoyance; that it lessens the apparent difference between the scenes of Scripture and common life; lessens the temptation to forget how near God is to us; helps us to feel our true condition, as full of supernatural wonders, could we but realize them, as ever was that of the Jews and patriarchs of old.

Moreover, the habit of thus considering Scripture will prove in some respects an important doctrinal safeguard. The Saints (be it spoken with all reverence) were types of the ALMIGHTY; their conduct in many respects analogous to His economies; and if we use ourselves to speak or think of them hastily and irreverently, the transition will be found less violent than some might imagine, to irreverent ways of speaking and thinking of Him. Those who can bring themselves to talk superciliously, and judge by mere modern measures, of the conduct of Abraham or Jacob, or of the destruction of the Canaanites, are perhaps in a fair way to question the reality of the Atonement, or the eternity of the wrath to come.

Lastly, the same considerations may prove available, in some material parts of discipline, devotional and moral;—teaching us to acquiesce with things which we cannot account for, in the conduct of those who are more experienced in God's service than ourselves, and especially assisting us to recognize the overruling Arm, even in the worst excesses and perversions of men, and to take all tranquilly, knowing from Whom it comes.

The subject which will naturally come next in order, is the Fathers' application of the Mystical Principle to the exposition of the New Testament.

§ v.—*Ancient Mysticism as applied to the Interpretation of the New Testament.*

§ v. 1. The object of this section is, allowing the fact, that the ancient interpreters did apply the mystical principle very largely to the New Testament, to point out some of the rules by which they conducted that process, the limits within which they confined it, and the good purposes, which, under such rules and limits, it was calculated to answer.

But the very mention of mystical interpretation, as applied to the Christian Scriptures, suggests *in limine* a plausible objection, which it may be as well to anticipate in some measure, before proceeding any further. It may and will be said, "Whatever one may think of the *degree* and *manner* in which they allegorized the *Old Testament*, all must allow that *to a certain extent* they were borne out by Scripture in so doing. But to allegorize the *New Testament* at all, what is it but turning the substance into a shadow, and by consequence unsettling the very foundations of religion?" Those accordingly, who wish to be very severe upon the Fathers, have thought proper, in treating of this head, to make mention of the wild and cloudy dreams of the early Quakers¹, and other modern enthusiasts; as if the two things admitted some kind of comparison.

Again, taking another point of view, it may be argued that such a line of interpretation coincides too nearly with that which St. Paul so earnestly deprecates in the Epistle to the Galatians. This, it may be said, is the very essence of the Law, that it had but a shadow of good things to come. By allegorizing the Gospel, you are so far making it also a shadow; and what is this but going back to the Law, and incurring at once all the anathemas which the zealous Apostle pronounces on all such disturbers of Christian perfection?

This way of objecting would be as just as it sounds plausible, if either the truth of the New Testament history, or what we may call the *completeness* of the dispensation, were impugned by

¹ E. g. Whitby, p. 8; 345; & Pref. p. lx.

the mystical interpretations current in antiquity. But such is by no means the case. As to the truth of the history ; something was said in a former section, to shew that even Origen and his followers, who are most censurable on that head, never thought of denying or doubting the main facts ; and that even where they speak most freely of minor details, as though the apparent discrepancies of the evangelical narrative could only be reconciled by supposing an admixture of allegory, it is not so much real contradiction, which they impute to the sacred historians, as an appearance of contradiction, which they assume to be intended and providential. § v. 2

Again, as to the other point, of completeness ; the danger of sweeping negatives is proverbial, yet I suppose one might safely challenge the production from any orthodox writer, or from any of the school of Origen who had not been condemned as a heretic, of a single passage, tending to make out the Gospel scheme imperfect, in the sense here alleged,—Judaically imperfect—a shadow and forerunner of better things to come even on this earth ; or as any other than the last and best of God's appointed ways of preparing His banished for restoration. Those blasphemies were reserved for such as Manes and Mahomet, and for that kind of infidelity, so current in our days, which allowing that the Gospel was well enough in its time, expects more however, in this and in coming generations, from the spirit of the age, than from the Spirit of the Church. We do not find even Origen's licentious disciples, who incurred Church censures in the fifth general council, stigmatized with any opinion of the kind.

History then does not warrant our attributing either of the supposed ill tendencies to the mystical way of expounding the New Testament ; and a little consideration will show that in reason and argument they are quite separable from it : as will be presently evident, on proceeding to inquire calmly, what this Mysticism, which has such an ill name, really amounts to ; and on what great principles it is grounded.

(2.) The nature and amount of it may be best understood, by producing a few examples ; which will serve also incidentally to shew, how early it prevailed in the Church of God, and by what

§ v. 2. high authorities it was undoubtedly sanctioned. Hear, for instance, St. Clement of Alexandria, descanting on the circumstances of the parable of the Good Samaritan. "Which of the three," says our LORD, "was neighbour to the sufferer?" The other answering, "He that showed mercy on him;" "Who then," says Clement¹, "is our neighbour, rather than the SAVIOUR Himself? To whom, rather than to Him, are we indebted for pity, all but slaughtered as we were by the rulers of the darkness of this world, with so many wounds, with fears, desires, angers, griefs, deceits, pleasures? Of all these wounds the only healer is JESUS, cutting out entirely every passion by the roots, not as the Law did, the produce merely, the fruits of the pernicious plants, but laying His own axe to the roots of iniquity. This is He who pours the wine, the blood of the vine of David, into our wounded souls; who from the tender mercies of the FATHER brings oil, and that in abundance: this is He who makes known to us the indissoluble bands of health and salvation; charity, faith, hope; this is He who hath enjoined angels and authorities and powers to minister to us for a great reward: i. e. for the deliverance which themselves also shall receive from the vanity of the world at the revelation of the glory of the Sons of God."

Besides the main lesson or moral of the parable, he assumes it to be full of designed allusions (and surely as he exhibits them they are very beautiful allusions) to the mystery of the Gospel, the process of our salvation by CHRIST. Neither would it be safe to attribute this to the play of Clement's own imagination, or to the manner of the Alexandrian school. For we find the same turn given to the parable by Irenæus, a far graver and less diffuse writer, and trained in a remote part of the Church, where there is no cause to believe that the writings of Philo or other Jewish mystics had any particular influence. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, argues thus on a circumstance of this parable¹. "The dew of God [the HOLY GHOST] is necessary to us, that we be not scorched nor made unfruitful, and that where we have an accuser, there also we may have an advocate [Para-

¹ De Div. Servand. § 29. p. 962. ed. Potter. ² Lib. iii. 19. p. 244. ed. Grab.

cletum]: For the LORD commends to the HOLY GHOST that man of His who had fallen among thieves, whom Himself pitied, and bound up his wounds; him CHRIST commends to the care of the HOLY SPIRIT, giving two pence, of royal coinage: in order, that we, who receive by the SPIRIT the image and inscription of the FATHER and the SON, may improve the penny committed to us, accounting for it with manifold increase to our LORD." § v. 3.

It will be perceived that Irenæus is even more express than Clement, in sanctioning the allegorical exposition of this parable. Clement's language might be accounted for, by supposing him merely to be indulging in a vein of half poetical allusion; but Irenæus produces his exposition as a theological argument against an error of the Gnostics; a part of whose creed was, that the *Æon* CHRIST descended on the Man JESUS at His Baptism. In opposition to which, St. Irenæus, maintaining, of course, that it was the HOLY SPIRIT which so descended, proceeds to show by many scriptural arguments, how conformable that circumstance was to the office assigned to the Comforter in the economy of salvation: *e. g.* to His regenerating influence in Baptism; to the miracle of Pentecost, as fulfilling the promise of our LORD; to the images of water, and dew, under which He is repeatedly described; and for his last instance he adduces, as we have seen, the circumstance of the good Samaritan on his departure committing the rescued traveller to another's care, until Himself should return; this Irenæus brings forward as a known and acknowledged type of the office of the HOLY GHOST, so well known and acknowledged, as to warrant him in reasoning from it to the interpretation of disputed passages.

So early, and in such high quarters, do we find warrant for considering our LORD's parables, with a view not only to the immediate moral of each, but also to certain hints of things future or supernatural, which even their minute details are supposed to convey; which is one considerable branch of New Testament Mysticism.

(3.) Another, and a yet more extensive one, relates not to His words, but to His conduct. It consists in tracing through details, apparently indifferent, of what befel our Divine Master on earth,

§ v. 4. providential illustrations of His dealings with His people, or of their future fortunes, trials, and behaviour. To take an instance which occurs not seldom, and is met with very early : the minute enumeration, varying in the different Evangelists, of the circumstances attending His last entry into Jerusalem. Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Tryphon, writes thus of a part of the dying prophecy of Jacob¹. "The expression, 'binding his foal to the vine, and his ass's colt to the choice vine,' was a foreshowing of the works wrought in His first coming, and of the Gentiles also, who were to believe in Him. For these were as a foal that had never borne a burden, nor taken any yoke upon his neck, until such time as this our CHRIST came, and sent His disciples, and made them followers of His own. Then they submitted to the yoke of His word, and bowed their backs to endure all things, for the blessing's sake which they waited for, and which he had foretold. And in fact, there was a certain she-ass with her colt, bound at the entrance of a certain village, by name Bethphage, which our LORD JESUS CHRIST, on the point of entering Jerusalem, commanded His disciples to bring to Him, and sitting thereon, He made His entry into the city. Which being notoriously done by Him, according to what had been prophesied of the future doings of CHRIST, made it evident that He was the CHRIST. . . But as to the circumstance, that the Prophetic Spirit agrees with the Patriarch Jacob, in mentioning the ass before accustomed to the yoke, as well as her colt, . . . as also that He Himself enjoined His disciples, as I said before, to bring both animals ; these things were a prophetic intimation to those also of your synagogue, who should concur with certain of the Gentiles in believing on Him. For as the colt unharnessed was a sign to those of the Gentiles, so also to those of your people the she-ass under her burthen. For the law given you by the Prophets is as a burthen laid on you."

(4.) The same interpretation is mentioned by Origen ; accompanying it however, as his manner is, with a conjecture of his own, which on the whole he seems to prefer. "I know," he writes²,

¹ P. 272. C. ed. 1736. ² In Joan. tom. x. 18. l. iv. 190. D.

"that some have interpreted the ass tied, to be the believers of the Circumcision, released from many bonds by those who truly and spiritually had become disciples of the Word. The colt, on the other hand, they expound to be the Gentile believers, who were at large before they received the doctrine of Jesus, and who in respect of their unbridled and self-pleasing ways, might be regarded as having shaken off every yoke. These expounders have omitted the circumstance of the multitude going before and following. However, one might perhaps, with some plausibility, make the former answer to Moses and the prophets, the latter to the Holy Apostles, entering all together into some mystical Jerusalem;" the meaning of which he next proceeds to point out.

The whole passage may serve as an instructive specimen of the difference between Origen and the generality of the Fathers. The exposition which he produces as second best, is evidently that in which the Church commonly acquiesced; as may further appear from the sanction afterwards given to it both by Ambrose and Augustin—Ambrose thus expressing himself¹. "Well is it written, '*on which never man sate*;' since none ever before CHRIST called the Gentile nations into the Church." Augustin again, speaking as of an allowed point²: "By the ass's colt on which never man had sat, we understand the people of the Gentiles, who had not received the law of the Lord. By the she-ass, (since both beasts were brought to the Lord) that portion of His congregation which came from the people of Israel; not altogether untamed, but such as to have known her master's crib."

But Origen, not contented with this prophetic interpretation of the event in question, states also as possible, and recommends as on the whole preferable, the following moral interpretation of the same: which however he advances (it is but justice to him to remark it) with expressions denoting unaffected reverence and modesty³. "Jesus," he conjectures, "is the Word of God, entering into the soul, here called Jerusalem, borne on the she-

¹ In Luc. lib. ix. 5. ² In Joan. Tract. 51. § 3. t. iii. pars i. p. 462. A.

³ In Joan. x. t. iv. 189. E.

§ v. 5. ass which His disciples had loosed from her bonds: *i. e.* on the uncorrupt writings of the Old Testament expounded by the disciples, whose business it is to solve them, and who are two in number: *i. e.* the two kinds of mystical interpretation, the moral and the prophetic: the one referring all things that are written to the healing of the soul, and with that view allegorizing them; the other exhibiting the good and true things to come, through those set before us in shadow. But He rides also on the young colt, the New Testament; (for in both we may find the word of truth,) to purify us, and expel those thoughts which bay and sell within us. And into Jerusalem, the soul, He enters not alone, nor yet with some few only; for many things must take place in us to go before the Word of God, which protects us, and very many to follow Him; all however hymning and praising Him, and spreading under Him their own array and vesture, that those which are His vehicles may not touch the earth, while He deigns to abide on them, who came down from Heaven."

Such is Origen's descant on this part of our LORD's history: into which he was probably led, as was before hinted, by his wish to preserve as much as might be of the moral mysticism of Philo and others, in addition, not in preference, to the kind of allegory more properly Christian. Whatever may be thought of the general principle, it will perhaps be allowed, that in this instance it is beautifully applied, and may remind us of one of the Advent Hymns of Bishop Taylor¹.

(5.) The arguments too are not contemptible by which Origen in the first instance vindicates the looking out for some mystical meaning in this passage². "I should like to ask those who

¹ Works. xv. 77. ed. Heber.

" Ride on triumphantly: behold, we lay
Our lusts and proud wills in Thy way.
Hosanna! welcome to our hearts. LORD, here
Thou hast a Temple too, and full as dear
As Sion, and as full of sin.
Nothing but thieves and robbers dwell therein—
Enter, and chase them forth, and cleanse the floor," &c.

² T. iv. 187. D.

think that nothing beyond the literal history was in St. Matthew's mind when writing his Gospel, what was the urgent necessity of sending the two disciples into the village over against Bethphage, to find and loose the ass tied and the colt with her, and bring them to Jesus. What was there especially worth recording in the fact that our LORD sat on the ass and colt, and so entered into the city? . . . If the prophecy of Zechariah merely predict the outward and bodily event as narrated by the evangelists, let us see how those who stay themselves on the letter keep entire the connecting thread of the prophecy; what they make of the passage immediately following, about cutting off the chariot from Ephraim and the horse from Jerusalem, &c. (an argument," he adds, "wherewith the Jews press us not slightly.) . . . They cannot say that the two animals were needed on account of the length of the way, that being only fifteen furlongs. . . . Nor do I suppose that it suits well with the majesty of the Son's Divinity, to say that so great a Being avowed Himself to have need of an ass tied and a colt with her."

There are other particulars which he mentions: but these may suffice for a specimen of the kind of criticism, by which the allegorical method was supported, when it began to be called in question: which does not appear to have been until Origen's time; the attack being most likely provoked by his incautious use of it. Certainly there seems to be a good deal of weight in such points of detail as he here alleges, not so much in behalf of his particular interpretation, as in establishing the general fact, that *some* spiritual meaning lies hid in these things; and if in them, then by parity of reasoning in other narratives, the particulars of which are (speaking humanly) as unaccountable as in this instance.

(6.) It may be worth while to add on this head one passage from Tertullian, as a striking example of the manner, in which those primitive readers of the New Testament caught up things which we esteem casual and transient, and improved them to spiritual purposes. He is showing how full Scripture is of allusions to the doctrine of Salvation by Water, and thus he sums up the incidental

§ v. 7. evidence of the Gospel history on that subject¹. "CHRIST is found never without Water; since Himself also is baptized in Water. It is by Water, at a marriage feast, that He makes what may be called the first inaugural essay of His power. In His discourse He invites the thirsty to that Water which is His, and eternal. Teaching of charity, He selects among works of kindness for special approbation, a cup of Water offered to a brother. It is by a Well that He recruits His strength; He walks on the Water, as though of set purpose; He [repeatedly] passes the Lake; He ministers Water to His disciples; nay, His testimony concerning baptism lasts even to His passion; when He is surrendered to crucifixion, Water comes in—witness the hands of Pilate; when He is wounded, Water bursts from His side—witness the spear of the soldier."

(7.) To this head belong the many spiritual allusions, which the ancient commentators seem to themselves to find, in the Names of places and persons, throughout our LORD's history. The principle on which they proceeded is laid down in a fragment of St. Clement of Alexandria². "When we are accurately searching the Scriptures, since it is acknowledged that they are written in parables, we ought by the names to trace out those notions of the things, which were, so to speak, in the mind of the HOLY GHOST, and which He there teacheth, having stamped His own meaning on the words."

And for this they seemed to find warrant, not only in the speculations of Pythagoras, (whom Clement quotes in illustration of his maxim,) and in the natural forebodings of mankind in general, as expressed in a well-known and very noble stanza of Æschylus³; but also still more in the history of the Old Testament, abounding as it does with names, both of persons and places,

¹ De Bapt. c. 9.

² P. 998, Ed. Potter.

³ Agam. 689, Ed. Butler, τίς ποθ' ὀνόμαζεν ὧδ'

ἔς τὸ πᾶν ἐτηγύμῳς,
μή τις, δντιν' οὐκ ὀρῶμεν,
προνοιάσι τοῦ πεπρωμένου
γλῶσσαν ἐν τυχαῖς νύμῳ; κ. τ. λ.

imposed (if one may so speak) sacramentally; *i. e.* by way of § v. 8.
token from the Most High of some future event, or hidden purpose. It probably seemed to Origen and those who followed him, but an extension of the same rule of interpretation, when they took pains (*e. g.*) to ascertain the Hebrew meaning of the names of the Baptist and his parents. "It may be profitable," he says¹, "as in many cases the true force of names is worth knowing, so in this place to consider the meaning of the names John and Zacharias: for as though it were a matter of no small consequence, at the time of naming him there was a providential interference." Then he proceeds to explain the three names: "John, *i. e.* grace from God, was born of Zacharias, *i. e.* the remembrance of God, according to the oath of our God, which is denoted by the name Elisabeth:" the three names together teaching that divine grace is the result of God's covenant blessing man's pious endeavours.

(8.) This example relates to persons: it may be well to give another which relates to the names of places. Origen had noticed a various reading of the name Bethabara, where John was baptizing; some copies write Bethania or Bethany, but Origen shews that this is geographically impossible, and follows up his argument, by remarking², "The interpretation of the name [Bethabara] suits the baptism of one who was making ready a people prepared for the Lord; for being translated it is, 'The House of Preparation:' whereas Bethany means, 'The House of Obedience.' For where else did it become him to baptize, who was sent as a messenger to prepare CHRIST's way before Him, than in the House of Preparation? and what more suitable birthplace than the House of Obedience, for Mary, who chose the good part which could not be taken away from her? for Martha, who was cumbered about waiting on Jesus? and for their brother, who was called Friend by the SAVIOUR? He therefore who wishes to understand the Holy Writings without omission must not despise minute attention to names."

Here, it will be perceived, he assumes his rule so entirely, as

¹ In Joan. tom. ii. 27. t. iv. p. 86.

² In Joan. tom. vi. 24. t. iv. 140. C.

- § v. 8. to think it of some consequence in settling the preference among various readings of the name of a place. And so just after¹, among other reasons for reading Gergesa instead of Gerasa or Gadara, as the scene of the miracle of the evil spirits and the herd of swine: "The interpretation," he says, "of Gergesa is, 'the abode of those who did cast out;' perhaps named, by a prophetic instinct, from the way in which the SAVIOUR was treated by those who besought Him to depart out of their coasts."

The like interpretations abound in St. Jerome, an author little likely to be biassed in their favour by the example of Origen, but qualified for them as Origen was, by his knowledge of the Hebrew, the want of which is probably the reason of their occurring less frequently, if ever, in Ambrose and Augustine. One might specify in particular the elegant way in which he has introduced more than one of them in the letter to Eustochium, which contains the itinerary of her mother Paula. He represents Paula addressing Bethlehem as follows²: "Hail, Bethlehem, the House of Bread, wherein was born that Bread which cometh down from heaven. Hail, Ephrata, region most abundant, and fruitful, the fertility whereof is God Himself." "Not³ far from thence she went down to the tower of Ader, i. e. the flock; near which Jacob fed his flock, and the shepherds watching by night were counted worthy to hear, 'Glory to God in the highest.' Presently after, quickening her pace, she began to travel along the old way which leads to Gaza, i. e. to the power or riches of God; when she thought of the Ethiopian eunuch." Again, on the passage of Jeremiah, "Behold⁴, I will send fishers and hunters, who shall hunt you out of every hill and mountain," he writes, "These are they whom the LORD sends out to fishing, and from fishers in the sea causes them to become fishers of men. Whence also the village of Peter and Andrew comes to be called by this name: for Bethsaida in our tongue is interpreted the House of Hunters."

¹ P. 141. B.

² Ep. 108. § 10; t. i. 698. C.

³ Ibid. 699. D; 700. A.

⁴ Comm. in Ezech. lib. ix. c. 28; t. v. pars i. p. 339. D.

It will have been observed, that some of these instances of allegorical names are taken not from our LORD's own history, but from that of St. John the Baptist; and it is certain that the Fathers generally consider all that happened to him, at least before our LORD's manifestation, as capable of and requiring an allegorical exposition: *e. g.* "the silence of Zacharias had a symbolical meaning," says Clement¹, "awaiting that offspring, which should be the forerunner of CHRIST; that the light of the truth, the word of the prophetic riddles, might become a gospel, or voice of good tidings, and so free itself of the mystical silence."

(9.) But when we come to the times after our LORD's Ascension, it may appear that we no longer find the same frequency, the same unhesitating freedom, of mystical exposition. Neither the Acts of the Apostles, nor the historical notices in the Epistles, are treated by them with the same constant allusion to mystical meanings, supposed to be undoubtedly contained in them. Instances of the kind are certainly not wanting; as where St. Augustin on the conversion of St. Paul, reasons on the name Ananias, which he supposes to mean a sheep²; and where Origen descants in the following way on St. Paul's recommendation of a collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem³. "Every one," says he, "who is spiritual, *i. e.* who serves GOD in the SPIRIT, and lives not according to the flesh, but according to the SPIRIT, he dwells in Jerusalem, *i. e.* in the place of Peace, and abides in the Vision of Peace: and he is one of the poor saints, *i. e.* one of those blessed poor, to whom our LORD said, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit.' . . . Being such he abides always in Jerusalem, possessing spiritual wealth. . . . On the other hand, it seems to me that those whom he calls Gentiles mean the less perfect souls, as standing in need of the instruction of the more perfect: and who, if so be they are accounted worthy to become partakers with them in spiritual understanding and knowledge, ought themselves to minister unto them in carnal

¹ S. Clem. Prot rept. c. i. 10.

² Serm. 279. 2. t. v. 788. E.

³ In Epist. ad Rom. lib. x. 14; t. iv. p. 679. D.

§ v. 9. things : and so, when their spirit begins to be imbued with something of loftier contemplation, the flesh also, taking on itself the reins of continence and of chastity, ought to minister to the spiritual precepts."

And even Chrysostom, who in general is very jealous of producing allegorical meanings, has an intimation that he does not consider them as out of place in this part of Scripture history. For, speaking of the name Dorcas, as repeated in the verse, "They showed the garments which Dorcas had made for them," he remarks¹, "Not without significance is her name added in this place, but with a view of giving us to understand that she answered to her name, watchful and alert as the animal which it signifies, the antelope. For no less than a special providence goes to the assigning of many names, as I have often remarked to you."

In spite, however, of scattered instances of this kind, it will perhaps hold, as a general observation, that mystical exposition is the exception, and not the rule, of the ancient commentators on the Acts and Epistles ; whereas through all former parts of the sacred history, it undoubtedly constituted the rule and not the exception. If this be really so, it is remarkable in several ways : and one thought which it obviously suggests is, that it proves the Mysticism of the ancients, right or wrong, not to have been practised at random, not to have been merely an unthinking accommodation to the taste of the age, the school, or the individual. In such case, it will be hard to assign a reason why it should not have been applied to the fortunes of CHRIST's people after His ascension, as largely as before His coming, or as to the events of His own life. Were the whole a matter of mere ingenuity, it will not surely be pretended, that the character and adventures of St. Paul, (for instance) might not be as dexterously turned into allegory, whether of the prophetic or moral kind, as those of David or St. John the Baptist. The abstinence of the ancient writers in this respect indicates their proceeding on some definite rule or principle, whether we can succeed in ascertaining the rule or no.

¹ In Act. Apost. Hom. 21, t. iv. p. 732. l. 33.

(10.) The several heads of New Testament Mysticism having § v. 10, 11. thus been briefly noticed and exemplified, and appearing to be *first*, the affixing spiritual import to the detail of parables, and to other imagery adopted by our LORD in His discourses ; *secondly*, the application of the like process to the circumstances of His history while on earth ; *thirdly*, to the names of persons and places any how connected with that history ; *fourthly*, and much more scantily, to the records of His Church after His departure ; we are in a condition to say something of the principles on which the whole depended, and the authorities by which, when challenged, they were accustomed to vindicate it : and in the course of the discussion it will perhaps sufficiently appear, what weight is due to the difficulty mentioned in the outset, *viz.* that allegorizing the New Testament at all is inconsistent with the idea of its being, eminently, *ἡ ἀληθεια*, the final dispensation—the substance and not the shadow.

It may seem, then, that the mode of interpretation we are considering arose chiefly from the deep sense which those who used it entertained of two great truths,—fundamental truths—of the Gospel: the Divinity of our LORD, and the Communion of Saints.

(11.) First, did we really lay it to heart, as we read verse after verse of the Gospels—did we in earnest put our minds to the thought,—that this JESUS of Nazareth, the Son of Mary, is indeed the Most High God, Creator and Possessor of Heaven and Earth, and of all things visible and invisible; did we realize our conviction of this truth in connection with each and all of His actions and discourses, and of the scenes and circumstances in which we find Him engaged ; we should of course feel on all these subjects, that which considerate persons feel in regard of all God's words and works ; *viz.* that the least of them is far too deep for us ; the most trivial of His commandments is exceeding broad ; the slightest, to our conception, of His acts *must* have eternal and infinite associations and consequences. The words then and doings of our Blessed SAVIOUR, being as they are the words and doings of GOD, it cannot be but they must mean far more than meets the ear, or the eye : they cannot but be full-charged with

§ v. 12. heavenly and mysterious meaning, whether we are as yet competent to discern some part of that meaning or no; and to look at them in that light may be called Mysticism, but is it any more than the natural and necessary result of *considerate* faith in His divine nature? Or can it be doubted, that so far as the Mysticism of the old interpreters is traceable to this conviction, so far it not only admits of justification, but the disuse of it is a fearful symptom of irreverent forgetfulness at least of that vital doctrine?

On grounds like these, we may perhaps be excused in thinking, whatever we may judge of the particular examples, that the Fathers could not be wrong in the general principle, which guided their comments in such instances as shall now be specified.

(12.) Knowing our LORD to be the Governor and Overruler of all things, even the least, by His good providence, knowing from His own lips that not a sparrow falls to the ground without Him: they could not be wrong in noting those circumstances and accompaniments of His conduct, which in ordinary human language would be called accidental, as being in fact divinely ordered: worthy, from their nearness to Him, of being contemplated with peculiar awe, as forming part of the clouds and darkness that He gathers round about Him: which if we can at all penetrate by the help of other revelations, it is well; if not, at least we may adore in silence.

For example; according to men's usual way of talking, it would be called an accidental circumstance, that there were *five* loaves, not more nor less, in the store of our LORD and His disciples, wherewith to provide the miraculous feast. But the ancient interpreters treat it as designed and providential, in this surely not erring: and their conjecture is, that it represents the sacrifice of the whole world of sense, and especially of the Old Dispensation, which being outward and visible, might be called the dispensation of the senses, to the FATHER of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, to be a pledge and mean of communion with Him according to the terms of the new or evangelical law. This idea they arrive at by considering the number five, the number of the senses, as the mystical exponent of the visible and sensible uni-

verse : τὰ αἰσθητὰ, as distinguished from τὰ νοητά. Origen lays § v. 12.
down the rule in express terms. "The number Five frequently, nay almost always, is taken for the five senses."

Accordingly St. Clement¹, speaking of the Tabernacle door, which was hung on *five* pillars, says it was accounted by some a token of the separation between the intellectual and sensible worlds; and he adds, "Thus, by a process full fraught with mysterious meaning, *Five* loaves are broken and multiplied by the SAVIOUR, to the crowd of ordinary hearers; for many one there be who regard the things of sense as if there were really nothing besides them."

Origen more plainly²: "By the five loaves they perhaps might signify the outward and literal words of the Holy Scripture, literal and sensible, and therefore represented by the number of the five senses." Ambrose again³, "It may seem that those five thousand, as though made up of the mere bodily senses, which are five, received from CHRIST nourishment as yet little more than bodily." And Augustin⁴: "To pass over this subject rapidly; the five loaves are understood to be the five books of Moses, with reason not represented as of wheat, but of barley, because they belong to the Old Testament. And barley, as you know, is so formed, that you come with difficulty to the nourishing part of it, wrapped up as it is in a covering of chaff, and that chaff stiff and cleaving, so as not to be stripped off without some trouble. Such is the letter of the Old Testament, clothed with the wrappings of carnal sacraments, or tokens; but if you once come to its marrow, it nourishes and satisfies. If we ask, who was the lad that bare the loaves, perhaps it was the people of Israel; with no more than childish thought bearing them only, not tasting them." And elsewhere, expressing himself in such a way as to connect his view obviously with that of St. Clement⁵. "The five barley loaves, wherewith the LORD fed the multitudes in the mountain, signify the old Law; either because it is given to persons not yet spiritual, but

¹ Strom. v. § 33.

² In Matth. tom. xi. 2; t. iii. 477. B.

³ In Luc. lib. vi. 80.

⁴ In Joan. tr. 24-5.

⁵ De Div. Quæst. 61; tom. vi. 24. F.

- § v. 13. still carnal, i. e. devoted to the five bodily senses ; or because the Law was given by Moses, and the books written by Moses are five."

It should still be recollected, that neither in this nor in other like instances is the tone of the Fathers at all dogmatical. They are *positive* only in one point, that there *is* a spiritual meaning, could we but find it¹ ; but of their own special exposition they commonly speak as doubtfully as Origen on this very place, whose language is ², " Thus far have I been able to reach in conjecturing the sense of the five loaves and the two fishes. But in all likelihood those who are better able to store themselves with [the spiritual food meant by] those symbols will be able to give a fuller account of these things."

It may be added, perhaps, in support of the exposition which he thus modestly suggests, that it suits well with the nature of the miracle, considered as an intimation of the future Eucharistical sacrifice : in which light the subsequent discourse of our Lord undoubtedly teaches us to consider it. For the offering of bread and wine, to be received back again as the Lord's Body and Blood, is in effect, as far as in each of us lies, the sacrifice of all the things of sense, of our whole earthly being, to be made heavenly by participation of JESUS CHRIST.

(13.) It is clear, again, referring to some examples given above, that the names of the several places which our Lord chose wherein to utter His discourses and work His miracles, will come under the head which we are now considering—that of circumstances which in ordinary history might be called insignificant, but in this can hardly be less than providential. Our Lord's moving from place to place, among the towns, mountains, and rivers of Israel, was the moving of the God and King of Israel, among the places which He Himself had marked out, from all ages, to be the scene of His mighty words and works, when He should literally visit His people.

So also, applying the same remark to His discourses, the

¹ Nihil vacuum, neque sine signo apud Deum. Iren. iv. 21 ; ed. Bened. It seems to have been a sort of Christian Proverb.

² Orig. ubi supra.

imagery which He used, His references to natural objects, are to be looked at with other and far higher feelings than those of mere wonder and delight, such as the same words would cause, could we imagine them proceeding from human lips. His mention (*e. g.*) of the birds of the air, the lilies, the vine and its branches, the wheat and tares, and whatever else occurs of the like kind, are so many instances of the CREATOR applying to moral or spiritual uses His own outward and visible works; which works He had created, knowing in His Omniscience that He should so apply them, and therefore (among their other final causes) with the very purpose of doing so. And it is but carrying the same observation one step further, to say, that His not unfrequent allusions to domestic processes also, and the simpler modes of trade, and husbandry work, are in like manner allusions to things which Himself had prepared by His providence, no doubt with a view to such application.

§ v. 14.

The great use to be made of this will be seen by and by: at present it may serve to mitigate the disapproving wonder, with which some readers are apt to receive what may appear to them the frigid and overstrained comments of the Fathers on the figurative language of our LORD, and the details of His parables.

(14.) For example, St. Clement¹ applies the Parable of Leaven to illustrate the reserve which all know to have been one great feature of the teaching of the early Church. "By it," he says, "the LORD indicates the method of concealment." Then, quoting the parable, he subjoins, "Either it is the *preservation* of the soul which our LORD here describes,—of the soul, made up as it is of three parts, [memory, understanding, and will] and preserved in the way of obedience by the spiritual power hidden in it, according to the faith; or else, [He speaks thus] because the Power of the Word, given unto us, compressed in a scanty space, but of great might, attracts to Itself secretly and invisibly the whole of him who receives It and lays It up within himself, and gathers the whole complex being of that man by

¹ Strom. v. 81.

§ v. 15. degrees into perfect unity." St. Augustin¹, and St. Ambrose², in effect give the same exposition ; all agreeing to annex a certain mystical force to the *three* measures ; to the *woman* ; whom they take to be the Church, or Wisdom ; to the *hiding* of the leaven : and so in other parables ; those things which modern critics regard as the mere scenery or dress of the narrative, *they* fear to dispose of so easily, considering that HE is speaking of them, who caused them to be what they are, with all their relations, similitudes, and association.

(15.) But if the Fathers considered as providential and mystical the mere ornaments of our LORD's discourses, and the accompaniments of His proceedings on earth, much more would they regard in the same view the substance of His conduct, His own voluntary doings. It would never come into their mind to think they knew the whole meaning and bearings of it, any more than to imagine, as they looked upwards at night, that they saw through the whole depth of the sky, because, gazing more intently than others, more and more stars had become visible to them. They seem to have contemplated the whole subject with that feeling of infinity, which dictated St. John's concluding verse, "If the things which JESUS did should be written every one, I suppose that not even the world itself should be able to contain the books which should be written." Akin to which is the saying of Origen³, "That the Gospel of St. John can hardly be understood but by one who should be like the writer of it, lying on the bosom of our LORD, and declared to be the Son of Mary, *i. e.* as it were another Jesus by communion with the true JESUS."

According to the depth of significance here attributed to the least of our LORD's doings, we are to look at the minute details of His demeanour towards different persons, His modes of dealing with them for their good, as so many exemplifications,—so many visible types,—of His invisible dealings and dispensations towards the same class of persons always. If even "wise men and scribes," parents, say, or teachers or masters, very often use significant actions, expressing things far beyond any dream,

¹ Quæst. Evang. i. 12; Serm. cxi. t. v. 392.

² In Luc. vii. 187, &c.

³ In Joan. i. 6.

that those who witness them can possibly have of their meaning; § v. 16.
shall it seem strange to be told, that we must regard all the actions of Him, who is infinite wisdom and goodness, as so many deep economies, answering, in all probability, purposes, of which we can no more judge, than a child in arms can judge of the meaning of the holy services, which he may chance at any time to see performed in a Church."

(16.) But to produce first a few instances, in which it seemed to the Fathers that we might in some measure interpret our LORD's significant actions:—Origen¹ has gone through great part of the discourse with the woman of Samaria, as a specimen of the way in which it pleases Him to deal with those who are not unbelievers but heretics: Irenæus expounds the washing the Disciples' feet to be a token of CHRIST communicating an interest in His Passion to all the Saints which had gone before, the whole Jewish and patriarchal Church. Thus he speaks², "In the last times, when came the fulness of the time of liberty, the WORD Himself by Himself cleansed away the filth of the daughter of Sion, washing with His own hands the feet of His Disciples. For this [in which we now are] is the end, [or last stage] of the human race entering on its inheritance, even GOD: that as in the beginning we were all brought into slavery by the debt of death [which we incurred], so in the end, by Him who is the Last, all who from the beginning had been Disciples, being cleansed and washed from the things of death, might enter into the life of God. For He who washed the feet of his Disciples, sanctified the whole body, and brought it into a state of pureness. Which is the reason also why He ministered food to them *as they reclined*, signifying those who were *reclining* in the earth, to whom He came to minister life."

Origen, and after him Ambrose³, assign a parabolical drift to the directions given by our LORD about preparing the Passover. "No one, keeping the Passover according to the will of JESUS, is below the upper room; but whosoever feasts with Him, is on high, in a large upper room, in an upper room swept, in an upper

¹ In Joan. xiii. t. iv. 212, &c.

² iv. 39.

³ In S. Luc. x. 47.

⁴ In Jerem. Hom. xviii. 13. t. iii. 256. C.

§ v. 17. room garnished and prepared : and if thou go up with Him to celebrate the Passover, He gives to thee no less a gift than the Bread of blessing, His own Body, and vouchsafes to thee His own Blood. Wherefore I beseech you, go up on high, lift up your eyes on high. And to me too, when I am engaged in teaching the Divine word, the Scripture says, 'Go up to the high mountain, thou who tellest good tidings to Zion.' " And St. Ambrose¹ takes occasion from the command about the pitcher of water, to descant in honour of holy Baptism, carried away, as the Fathers use to be on that subject, perhaps above all others.

(17.) It may be worth considering, whether the view in illustration of which these last examples have been offered, does not tend in some sort to explain and justify the practice which I have frequently mentioned, as not unusual with Origen and Clement, and with others who followed them, of adding to the *prophetical* or *evangelical* exposition of historical passages, what may be called a *moral* exposition also : of which an example has already been adduced from Origen, speaking of our Lord's entry into Jerusalem ; and the following may serve in further illustration of it². "The Lord in the Gospel affirms, concerning that woman who poured on His head the box of precious ointment, 'She hath wrought a good work on Me ;' intimating that he who pours ointment on the Word of God, i. e. who joins actual obedience with that Word, that man worketh a good work. For the Word adorned with obedience and right actions is rendered, as it were, fragrant, filled with all sweetness of precious ointments." Here would seem at first sight a confusion between the two senses of "THE WORD," standing sometimes for the Scriptures, sometimes for the Person of our Lord. But the difficulty will perhaps vanish, on considering that the Word written or spoken was regarded by Origen as one only among many forms, in which the personal Word vouchsafes to communicate Himself to His servants. The things then which befel our Lord "visibly and personally " might well be taken as symbolical of the mode, in which His inward and invisible presence acts on, and is received by, the hearts of His servants ; as Origen himself gives us to

¹ In Luc. lib. ix. 48.

² In Rom. ii. 5. & iv. 480. B.

understand, explaining the declaration of St. John the Baptist¹, § v. 18.
“There standeth one among you whom ye know not,” of “the presence of our Lord’s most high Nature in all reasonable souls, reaching through the whole world.” Comments, accordingly, in the Alexandrian and other Fathers, which at first sight might appear like mere metaphysical disquisitions, about the supremacy and operations of reason, may be understood of CHRIST, and the operations of His grace; only recollecting that the ancients in their piety ascribed all sound reason to the Word, or Wisdom, of the Father, enlightening the soul.

(18.) The Divinity then of our Lord, and His relation to mankind, would cause us to feel sure that all His words and doings must be so far mystical, as that they mean more, infinitely more, than meets the eye and ear of the mere human observer. But His Incarnation and Economy, of which His words and actions are part, may have had other objects, relative to other races and other states of being. Who knows but any given work or discourse of His may have reference to some of these, and we may have, consequently, to wait for its full explanation until (if ever) our eyes be opened to behold them in another world? Certainly there are obscure hints in Scripture, there is a partial, a very partial, disclosure, of some change in heaven as well as on earth, to be wrought by the Incarnation of the Son of God. “The principalities and powers in heavenly places,” it is intimated, have some deep though undefined interest in that unspeakable Work of God, which is our sanctification and salvation. Such hints unquestionably the New Testament contains: and it was the part of watchful piety, such as that of the Fathers, to notice and store them up: and what more natural, than that they should sometimes remember them, when engaged in the obscurer portions of the Gospel history, and should say within themselves, What if such and such a saying of our Lord, such and such a circumstance of His behaviour, evidently too profound for us, should belong to Him as the Lord of Angels rather than of men,—should allude to His government of heaven rather than of earth?

By this train of thought, they would evidently open to them-

¹ In Joan. t. ii. 29. tom. iv. 89. D.

- § v. 19. selves a new source of (what is called) Mysticism : the principle of which can hardly be denied, however unsoundly or presumptuously the details may have been managed. One or two examples shall be produced from Origen, the writer on whose mind these thoughts appear to have made most impression.

He¹ applies the prophetic saying of our LORD, "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold," in part to the ministering angels, who "look forward," he says, "with the rest of the Creation, to the revelation of the Sons of God, for whom they are commissioned to minister (being so far," as he expounds it, "'made subject unto vanity') that they with the objects of their ministration may receive the inheritance of salvation, that of earthly and heavenly things there may be one fold and one shepherd." It may be remarked, by the way, that this comment on the place in the Romans, right or wrong, is not Origen's own. It occurs, as we have seen, in Clement's exposition of the parable of the good Samaritan. "CHRIST has commanded the authorities and powers to minister to us for a great reward, viz. that themselves may be delivered from the bondage of corruption." Again, Origen² considers the case of the fallen Angels to be very probably part of our LORD's meaning, in that very awful Proverb, "There are first which shall be last, and there are last which shall be first." And every where he is full of the presence of the elect Angels, and delights in contemplating our invisible communion with them; not always perhaps judiciously, yet surely on the whole more wisely and scripturally, than they who banish the doctrine out of their thoughts, as though it were either a mere figure of speech, or an economy long laid aside, and to us mere matter of history.

(19.) So much for that portion of the New Testament Mysticism, which seems to arise from the constant remembrance of the Omniscience of JESUS CHRIST, and His Supreme Dominion over things visible and invisible. Another large class of similar instances will be found, derived from another fundamental truth, viz. the Communion of Saints. By the Communion of Saints,

¹ In Ep. ad Rom. lib. vii. 4. t. iv. 597, 598.

² De Div. Servand. 29.

³ In Matt. xv. 27. t. iii. 692.

is here meant the real, but mysterious and supernatural union of **JESUS CHRIST** with His Body the Church, and with every member of that Body: by virtue of which, the actions and sufferings of the Head may be predicated of the Body, and conversely those of the Body, of the Head: Israel may stand for **CHRIST**, and **CHRIST** for Israel: the one, *e. g.* where Moses is said to have "esteemed the reproach of **CHRIST**," *i. e.* of God's Church and people, which is in **CHRIST**'s account one with Him, "more than the treasures of Egypt:" the other, where Hosea, combining in one expression the past and the future, says, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called My Son out of Egypt." § v. 20.

Again, David is a type of our **LORD**, and through Him of the Church which is His Body, and through that again of each individual Christian as being a member of that Body: and therefore the Psalms generally are adopted by the whole Church in her assemblies, and by separate believers in their closets, with equal propriety, as the language of their devotions: they are an inspired Liturgy, provided for all ages and all lands.

As, therefore, the Divinity of our **LORD** even forces a considerate person to regard His demeanour towards those who came near Him in the body, as indicative of His ways of grace and trial towards us, with whom He is invisibly present: so the unity between Him and His Church would lead us to inquire, from time to time, whether things which we find happening to Him may not be prophetic tokens of the future fortunes of the Church; as well as His conduct a lesson to her, how to bear herself in her conflicts with the world.

(20.) But here the nature of the case would enforce an important distinction between the allegory of the Old Testament and that of the New; *i. e.* so far as both are prophetic. In the Old Testament the leading idea is, that the Church, whether diffusive, or embodied in her anointed members, king, priest, or prophet, is every where the type of **CHRIST**; in the New, that **CHRIST** conversely is the type of the Church. "They from Sheba shall come, they shall bring gold and incense:"—doubtless the immediate aspect of this prophecy is towards the wise men's offering at Bethlehem; but that offering was itself prophetic of the kings

§ v. 20. of the earth coming in, and laying their glories at the feet of the Church, as the representative of CHRIST on earth. Again, "He shall bruise them with a rod of iron, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel"—is transferred in the Acts from David to CHRIST, and in the Revelation from CHRIST to the Church. Our LORD being in this sense also both Alpha and Omega, the end of the ancient types and the beginning of a new series. In Him all that happened before was, as it were, brought to a point; and all again that should come after, was but so many developments of what He said, did, and suffered among us.

But it can scarce be necessary to dwell much on this part of the subject, since Christians in general appear to feel that each greater event of our LORD's abode on earth, His Passion, for example, in all its circumstances, was prophetic of the treatment which the Church, His Body, might expect, and at the same time symbolical of the inward process, whereby each one of His members should be trained and purified. The very expression, "taking up the Cross," seems to imply as much as this.

But if so, surely there is something to be said for the introduction of the same idea in other passages also of our SAVIOUR's life, and in explanation of other sayings of His. For example, there is a very ancient gloss on the saying, "Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head." "In this," says Clement of Alexandria¹, "I suppose there is an allusive meaning; viz. that with him only who believes, and is perfectly separated from all those who in Scripture are described as wild beasts, does a resting place use to be found for the Head of all beings, the gracious and gentle WORD;" as if our LORD's literal want of a home, when He was here in the body, betokened the scarcity, which should ever be found on earth, of souls apt to receive and lodge Him worthily. Foxes would always find their dens, and birds of the air their nests: crafty and soaring thoughts would always find hearts enough ready to entertain them: not so the frank and open, the meek and lowly, SPIRIT of CHRIST.

¹ Strom. i. 23.

Such is St. Augustin's explanation¹ (amongst others); and it § v. 21.
appears to be so far warranted, as that it is only an additional application of the same principle, which teaches us, with St. Cyprian², to consider CHRIST's coat without seam as a token of the unity of His Church, which her enemies, doing their worst, should be unable to rend: or with Clement³, to look on His baptism as a token and type of ours. "The LORD," he affirms, "is consecrated by the bath alone, and sanctified by the descent of the HOLY GHOST. So it is; and the same thing happens in us also, of whom the LORD is the type: by baptism we are enlightened, by enlightening we are adopted, by adoption we are consecrated [or perfected], by consecration [or perfecting] we are immortalized." St. Paul's language to the Romans and Colossians, implying CHRIST's death and resurrection to be, sacramentally and virtually, that of each baptized person, is too well known to be more than just alluded to. And there is imagery in the Revelations, in the vision of the Two Witnesses, which may justify us in surmising that the same awful events may in some sense find their counterpart in the history of the Church on earth.

Whoever will consider and follow out these and similar hints, will see reason, perhaps, to excuse many things, which a hasty reader of the Fathers would call over-bold and fanciful: he will understand how Origen might affirm⁴, that there are in fact as many different manifestations of the WORD, as many different CHRISTs, as there are believers: and again, that those who rest content with the mere outward meaning of the Gospel history, not recollecting as they go on, that in this same JESUS they live, and move, and have their spiritual being—that He is one with them, and they with Him—they are in the same kind of error as the Judaizers, who could not find Him in the Old Testament.

(21.) So far then as the mystical interpretation of the Gospels depends on the Communion of Saints, it would appear to be amply authorized by the Scripture itself: neither need we be long to seek for similar authority in behalf of that branch of it, which

¹ Quæst. in Matth. v. t. iii. pars 2, p. 201. C.; in Ps. 90. Serm. 2. § 7, t. v. 733. E.

² De Unit. Eccl. t. i. 110. Ed. Fell.

³ Pædag. i. 26. .

⁴ In Joan. vi. 3, t. iv. 146. C.

§ v. 22. has been already exemplified : that, namely, which results from the constant endeavour to realize, as we read, our LORD's high and transcendent Nature. As to His Parables, it is certain that in those which He has condescended to explain, in that of the Tares for example, every circumstance almost is made to tell ; so far from the attention being limited, as many modern interpreters would limit it, to the general result and moral only. Many of His actions are ascertained to be symbolical, in the way of prophecy, or moral, or both : some by their correspondence with direct Parables ; as the cursing of the fig-tree, which agrees remarkably with the Parable of the barren fig-tree ; the multiplying the loaves and fishes, illustrated by the subsequent discourse on the Bread from Heaven ; and the miraculous draught of fishes, explained by the Parable of the net. Other actions, or circumstances of actions, have their figurative nature indicated by the use of some symbol, which God's providence has made appropriate, (*οἰκεῖον*, as the rhetoricians call it,) to some particular subject ; as the change of water into wine, where the appropriation was made known afterwards by the institution of the Holy Eucharist. In other cases, as the choice of the ass and colt for the entry into Jerusalem, above considered, the terms of ancient Prophecy were a key to the mystery of the action. As to the miracles of our LORD's mercy, healing, cleansing, enlightening, reviving,—there were sufficient hints given by Himself, in the conversations which followed upon some of them, how He would have them interpreted : as when He remarked on the case of the man who had been blind from his birth, "For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind:" and in the Parable of the relapsed dæmoniac.

(22.) The above considerations may perhaps put us in a condition to account in some measure for the comparative absence of Mysticism in the comments of Antiquity on the Acts and Epistles. Those, with whose words and actions those later Christian Scriptures are conversant, were actually in the Kingdom of Heaven: they were arrived at that final condition,—final as regards this world,—to which all former types and shadows had pointed, and in

which, visibly or invisibly, they were now to be realized. They were not themselves, as far as we know, types and shadows of any thing further. Their condition indeed was full of mystery, of high, spiritual, invisible relations and associations: and so is our own condition, for theirs and ours are in substance one. But scantily and seldom, if at all, is any portion of the veil withdrawn, so as to justify the same kind of comment on the hidden bearings of the Apostles' history, or of that of any subsequent generation of believers, which God Himself had taught us to venture on, in all preceding Scriptures. With the exception of those sacramental actions, which being performed according to His command, are to be regarded as purely and indeed His actions, there are now no visible doings of CHRIST on earth: none, that is, visibly distinct from the doings of men; none therefore to which we are warranted in specially affixing a mystical character, as being both the doings of God, and of Him who is one with the Church and with each of us. "CHRIST is the *end* of the Law for righteousness to every man that believeth:" that verse being once for all realized, the vision and prophecy is of course sealed up; for there can be nothing beyond the end. § v. 23.

(23.) On the whole, there seems no want of scriptural authority for the allegory as applied by the Fathers to the New Testament, considered both in what it includes, and in what it omits. Most modern interpreters even, and almost all devotional writers, recognise it in principle, some perhaps more or less unconsciously: but the great difference between them and the Ancients seems to lie rather in this; that the Ancients fear not to carry it out, in every part of the Gospels, and as far as it will go in every case; whereas we, in modern times, each draw his own arbitrary line, according to our own taste, or our notions of what is useful or convincing, or out of deference to the judgments we expect from others.

And some perhaps may say, "After all, where is the great harm of this? the other may certainly be more legitimate and consistent in reasoning; but practically, is it not safer, is it not even more religious and reverent, to abide by the letter, instead of perplexing yourself with expositions of which you cannot be quite sure?" This, perhaps, is a thought not unlikely to be enter-

§ v. 24. tained by many minds. But let us be aware which way it leads :— to what, in reality, it amounts. Discarding high associations from our interpretations of Scripture, under the notion that a plain man may do well enough without them, appears rather like discarding high doctrines from our creed, as if they were only fit for professed theologians. It may be, that the one does not always lead to the other, but they may be symptomatic of the same unhealthy frame of thought : and is it not generally found, in fact, that the two more or less accompany each other, both in schools of divinity and in the fluctuation of individual minds ? Whitby's intense scorn of the ancient allegories was a step to the Arianism in which he finally acquiesced : and we know too well the region of doctrine towards which the merely critical and historical discussions of the last century were continually gravitating. Surely these are things worth the consideration of those, who shrink not only from promulgating, but even from fairly examining, the old principles of Biblical exposition, for fear of giving too much play to the imagination, or some such kind of irreverence. Are they not unconsciously behaving like Ahas, who, when God Himself offered him a sign, refused to ask, under the pretence or notion, that to do so would be tempting the Lord ?

(24.) It is most true, there is a great danger in the mystical contemplation of the Scriptures, more especially of the Gospels, by how much the Word of Life is there brought nearer to us, to be not only heard of, but also to be seen with our eyes, to be looked upon and handled with our hands. There is a great, an unspeakable danger, if our practice be not conformable. But this danger is not peculiar to the process of spiritual interpretation ; it belongs equally to all ways of communicating the secrets of the Kingdom of Heaven ; to the Creeds and Prayers of the Church ; to the Catechisms which all children learn. And the remedy for it is not, in this or any other instance, to hide our eyes indolently from the light, which we know shines round us, but to strengthen them gradually, that they may be able to bear it ; and this can only be done by moral means ; i. e. by repentance, devotion, and self-denial. As we train ourselves, so also, according to our means, should we endeavour to prepare others,

for the right study of the Bible. He who looks no deeper than the letter, may simply recommend candour, and patient investigation, and freedom from sensual and other disturbing thoughts : but he who knows beforehand, that the Personal Word is every where in the written Word, could we but discern Him, will feel it an awful thing to open his Bible; fasting, and prayer, and scrupulous self-denial, and all the ways by which the flesh is tamed to the SPIRIT, will seem to him no more than natural, when he is to sanctify himself, and draw near, with Moses, to the darkness where God is. And this so much the more, the more that darkness is mingled with evangelical light; for so much the more he may hope to see of God; and we know Who it is, that has inseparably connected seeing God with purity of heart.

As therefore God's people are continually to be told, concerning the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, that it is infinitely dangerous to come near it unworthily, but they are not therefore to leave it out of their minds, but rather to think of it night and day, that they may prepare themselves, and come as God would have them : so is it with this mystical presence of JESUS CHRIST in every part of the Scriptures. We are not to shrink from the thought of it for fear of irreverence, but bearing it continually in mind, we are to train ourselves so, that we may have grace to discern it, according to our measure, in particulars. This training is no matter of intellectual acuteness, industry, and memory : they will only mislead into some wrong kind of Mysticism, if separated from a single mind, and a heart full of reverence : but he that is willing indeed to do His will, he shall know *περὶ τῆς διδασχῆς*, "concerning the manner of teaching," as well as the substance, "whether it be of God." Common sense surely will add, that one necessary sign of this willing reverence of heart, will be our religiously walking by the clue, which the ancient Church has given us, wherever we can keep satisfactory hold of it; never daring to contradict the unanimous voice of the Fathers, still less to treat with scorn and mockery the serious opinion, though it be but of one among them.

(25.) On the other hand, no ignorance, not even inability to read, disqualifies men from thus receiving our Lord in His Scriptures.

§ v. 25. It does not hinder them from seeing God's hand in His *natural* Providence, in His care of their own and others' welfare: why should it make them incapable of perceiving His *supernatural* Providence, (if one may so call it)—the presence of His CHRIST,—in all those works of His, the record of which they hear from time to time in Church, or at home out of their Bibles? Such perception of our LORD's presence, through the veil of the letter, is in fact the religious improvement of the fondness for type and parable, natural to all, but often most developed in those who have least means of acquiring literal instruction. From which it would seem, that we need not fear to inure even poor unlearned persons, having the fear of God, and leading good lives, with the ancient mode of exposition. Humanly speaking, their habits of thought make them for the most part apter to receive it, than persons of greater learning and refinement.

But whether to wise or simple, to learned or unlearned, the great and certain advantage of this method, (over and above its positive truth) is this: that it tends so directly in every part and parcel of the Scriptures, to keep up the conviction that God in CHRIST is there, ready to reveal Himself to us with a blessing, if we seek Him religiously and worthily. This conviction, continually realized and acted on, will prove to be of unspeakable value, though we never were conscious of a single discovery, a single new interpretation, in the ordinary sense of that term. Such faithful self denying labour will be worth a double "hidden treasure" to us, bringing us secretly into closer Communion with Him, in whom are now hidden, one day to be revealed, "*all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.*"

These remarks may suffice, on the manner of the Fathers as Mystical Interpreters of the Bible. We shall next have to consider them as Mystical Observers of natural and providential things, and of the visible world around us: a kindred subject, as a little inquiry will show.

§ vi.—*Mysticism as applied to the Works of Nature, and generally to the external World.*

Whatever judgment persons may be inclined to form of the early Christian interpretations in themselves, it is clear and certain matter of fact, and surely well worthy of remark, that on all the great divisions of human knowledge the Fathers had, as a school, views of their own. Whether it was history of which they were speaking, or the arts of life, or morals public or private, their measures of things, and the tone they preserved, were widely different from all that had gone before them: hardly more so, however, (it is a startling but true confession,) than they differ from the principles and manner adopted in other ages, especially perhaps in our own, by Christian writers on the same subjects. § vi. 1.

But of all branches of human knowledge there is none in which this difference is more strongly marked, than in what relates to the study of nature, and the laws and aspects of the external world. We know how very large a part of modern literature and education, nay, and of modern theology too, is occupied by instruction and research on physical subjects, and in what a tone of self-complacency men praise their times and one another, for the great and rapidly increasing proficiency of the two or three last generations in their knowledge and command of the powers of nature. But when we turn to the first ages of Christian literature, the very first sentiment which strikes us is, the care taken every where to exclude views merely scientific and physical,—to prevent our acquiescing in that kind of knowledge, as though in itself it were any great thing. Hear, *e. g.* the tone in which St. Augustin explains what attention is due from a Christian to that, which of all physical sciences we are taught sometimes to account the most elevating,—to astronomy.

“The knowledge,” he says¹, “of the rising and setting, and other motions of the stars, though it bind men by no superstition,

¹ De Doctr. Christ. ii. 46.

§ vi. 2. yet is of little or rather no avail for the explanation of Holy Scripture, but is rather an impediment, by diverting attention unprofitably : and inasmuch as it is closely connected with the most deadly error of the chanters of silly predictions, it is better and more creditable to let it pass." Some might perhaps imagine that in this passage St. Augustin was ignorantly confounding astronomical with astrological science. But the next sentences contradict the suspicion. "It is true," he adds, "that besides the observation of existing phenomena, astronomical science contains in it something of the nature of history, inasmuch as from the present positions and motions of the heavenly bodies we may, according to certain rules, retrace their movements in times past. Again, it hath certain rules for judging of things future ; not in the way of mere conjecture and omen, but fixed and settled rules ; not such as to authorize our concluding aught from them concerning our own conduct and fortunes, which is the madness of those who calculate nativities—but facts appertaining to the heavenly bodies themselves. For as the computers of the lunar motions, observing how old the moon is to-day, are able to assign its age at any distance of years forward and backward, so concerning any heavenly body whatever, scientific reckoners are wont to give determinate answers."

It was not then from inadequate conceptions of the true province and evidence of astronomy, that St. Augustin assigned to it so low a place in the pursuits of a Christian student ; but it was clearly from a perception that such knowledge was but very remotely connected with the proper duty and happiness of mankind. And St. Augustin was no unlearned man, nor at all apt to set himself fanatically against the use of human knowledge in the interpretation of Divine Truth.

(2.) But in truth he was here only expressing the constant sentiment of the Church, such as we find it laid down in the first and second ages, almost in the form and with the authority of an apostolical canon. "It is better," says Irenæus¹, "to know nothing at all, no, not so much as one single cause of any of the

¹ ii. 45.

things which are made, but to believe in God, and to persevere § vi. 2.
in love, than to be puffed up with that sort of knowledge, and
fall from love, which gives life to man. It is better to seek
nothing in the way of knowledge but JESUS CHRIST the SON of
God, who was crucified for us, than to fall into impiety through
subtle questions and minute verbal discussions. Suppose, *e. g.*
that any one, more or less elated with efforts of this kind, should
take occasion from our LORD's saying, 'The very hairs of your
head are all numbered,' to make curious inquiry, and search out
both the number of hairs in each person's head, and the cause
why one has so many, and another so many . . . and so per-
sons fancying they had discovered the right number, should
endeavour to give it a meaning in reference to the teaching which
they had devised for their own sect : or again, suppose that any
one, upon the saying in the Gospel, 'Are not two sparrows sold
for a farthing, and not one of them can fall to the earth without
the will of your FATHER,' should take upon him to enumerate
the sparrows which are daily taken in this place and that, and in
all places, and make out the reason why so many were caught
yesterday, so many the day before, and again so many to-day ;
and connect the said number of sparrows with his own argument :
doth not such an one altogether deceive himself, and are not those
who agree with him forced along with him into great impiety ?
Men being always forward in such speculations, that they may
obtain the credit of having made out each something more than
his master.

"Again, suppose a man should ask us, 'Doth not God know the
whole number of all things which have been and are being made ?
Did not each of these numbers receive by His providence the
amount which was suitable to it ?' we of course should assent,
and allow that nothing ever did or doth come into being without
the knowledge of God ; that by His providence is assigned to
each of them its proper kind, place, number and quantity ; that
nothing at all ever was or is made vainly or at random, but with
great fitness and a lofty kind of harmony. Whereupon it would
follow, that there was something admirable and truly divine in
that method, which should be able both to discover and express

§ vi. 3. the said numbers with their proper causes. Suppose him then, on receiving from us such allowance and consent, to proceed to enumeration of the sand and pebbles of the earth, yea, also of the waves of the sea, and the stars of heaven, and to invent causes for the number which he fancied himself to have found; would not his labour be justly judged vain by all considerate persons, and he himself bereft of all sense and reason? And by how much he employs himself more than others in inquiries of that kind, and the higher opinion he has of his own peculiar inventions, calling others ignorant, and ordinary, and carnal; so much the rather is he to be judged senseless and stupid, like a planet-struck person, making himself equal with God. Yea, by the knowledge which he fancies himself to have attained, he surpasses God Himself, and aims his speculations higher than the very greatness of His Maker."

It is plain that the author of this impressive warning did not only fear the fanciful application of natural science to the things of God, but also the tendency which it has in itself to make men overweening and irreligious. It is plain also that he did not consider this evil tendency sufficiently disproved by that constant reference to the final causes of things, on which many now seem apt to rely, as taking out the sting of physical studies entirely. His painful intercourse with heresy had taught him, that the fancy of possessing rare insight into the purposes of the Author of Nature is almost as great a snare, as the habit of contemplating nature without reference to any Author. The very attempt to know all—the very dreaming of such a thing—he felt was impiety; a deep sense of our necessary ignorance, and an humble acquiescence in it, the only safeguard of the inquisitive ingenious mind.

(3.) Accordingly, those ancient writers, who have dwelt most on the wisdom of God in the creation—such as St. Basil, in his *Hexaëmeron*, and St. Ambrose, his imitator, one might almost say, his translator—have not thought it enough for piety, to urge every where the final causes of things, as disclosed by natural philosophy and history, but have also, again and again, admonished their readers, that no laws of nature will account for every

thing, that the wisest must soon come to a point, where he must stand still, and say, "Thus far I seem to trace things, but I can go no farther; I can but make acknowledgment with those Egyptian philosophers, 'This is the finger of God.'" § vi. 3.

Thus St. Ambrose, being about to enter on the detail of Creation in the second day's work, prefaces his remarks with a solemn caution¹, "not to weigh what should be said by the traditions of philosophy, and its empty deceit, nor to gather up persuasive probabilities; but to choose for their standard the rule of truth as expressed in the oracles of the Divine word, and poured into the bosom of the faithful by the contemplation of so high majesty: since it is written, 'Establish me in Thy words. The ungodly have propounded unto me discourses—*διηγῆσαντο ἀδολεσχίας*—but not after Thy law. All Thy commandments are truth.'

"It is not, therefore, by the nature of the elements, but by the nature of CHRIST, who hath done all according to His will, abounding in the fulness of His Godhead, that we are to order our thoughts of what was made, and our inquiries into that which nature could bring about. Even as in the Gospel, when He was curing the leprous, and pouring light anew on the eyes of the blind, the people present and beholding His works acknowledged not any course of medical cure, but, in admiration of the LORD's power, gave, as it is written, glory to God. Nor was it on calculation of the numbers of the Egyptians, the combinations of the heavenly bodies, the proportions of the elements, that Moses stretched forth his hand to the division of the Red Sea, but in simple obedience to the commandment of God's power. Whence also he saith himself, 'Thy right hand, O LORD, hath waxed glorious in power: Thy right hand, O LORD, hath dashed in pieces the enemy.'

"That way, therefore," concludes St. Ambrose, "that way do ye lift up your minds, ye who form this holy congregation; and turn your whole spirit in that direction. God seeth not as man seeth: God looketh on the heart, man on the outward appearance. By the same rule, neither doth man see as God doth.

¹ Hexaëm. ii. 3.

- § vi. 3. Thou hearest, that God saw, and approved : far be it then from thee to judge by thine eyes of the things which He made, or by thine own thoughts to argue concerning them ; rather, what God saw, and approved, see that thou account not those things matter of free discussion."

This by way of general caution. Afterwards, in a question about the conflux of the waters on the third day, he gives a specimen of the mode in which ancient piety would silence physical objections. He supposes a mere physiologist objecting to the literal truth of the Mosaical statement, that, according to the nature of water, it must have found its level before ; it could not need the special divine command. St. Ambrose's answer is, virtually¹, " How do you know, that before God gave the command it was the nature of the waters so to glide or flow ? For this is a quality which they have of their own, not after the manner of the other elements, but special and peculiar ; not by any certain order of causes, but by the direct will rather, and operation of the Most High God. What He commanded, they hear. Now the Voice of God is that which gives being to nature. The actual operation of things was, and is, but the fulfilment of that Word. Presently water begins to flow, and to pour itself into one assemblage, having hitherto been diffused over the earth, and keeping its place in many different receptacles. I read nothing of its course before ; of its motion, before, I learn nothing ; mine eye hath not seen, nor mine ear heard. The water was stationary in divers places ; at the Voice of God it was put in motion. Doth it not appear that its nature was communicated to it by the aforesaid Voice of God ? His creature followed His commandment, and turned His law into an usage. Thus the law of His first establishment of things bequeathed them a form to all future time. To conclude : He made day and night once for all : from that moment continues the alternation and renewal of each of them, throughout so long a time. Even so was the water commanded to run into one assemblage, and from thenceforth it does so run."

¹ Lib. iii. 8, t. i. 41.

This principle obviously applies no less to all the great simple facts in nature : it is the principle of natural piety, " things are such, because God made and keeps them such : " the most skilful analyst, the most dextrous combiner of machinery, must come to this at last : and if he would but be content to refer to it, and realize his dependence on it, throughout, he would go far towards securing himself from the peculiar dangers of his line of study¹. § vi. 4.

(4.) But the one great and effectual safeguard against such idolizing of the material world, or rather of our own minds acting upon it, is the habit of considering it in that other point of view, to which Christian Antiquity would guide us, as earnestly as it would withdraw us from the speculations of the mere natural philosopher. I mean the way of regarding external things, either as fraught with imaginative associations, or as parabolical lessons of conduct, or as a symbolical language in which God speaks to us of a world out of sight : which three might, perhaps, be not quite inaptly entitled, the Poetical, the Moral, and the Mystical, phases or aspects of this visible world.

Of these, the Poetical comes first in order, as the natural groundwork or rudiment of the other two. This is indicated by all languages, and by the converseation of uneducated persons in all countries. There is every where a tendency to make the things we see represent the things we do not see, to invent or remark mutual associations between them, to call the one sort by the names of the other.

The second, the Moral use of the material world, is the improvement of the poetical or imaginative use of it, for the good of human life and conduct, by considerate persons, according to the best of their own judgment, antecedent to, or apart from, all revealed information on the subject.

In like manner, the Mystical, or Christian, or Theological use of it is the reducing it to a particular set of symbols and associations, which we have reason to believe has, more or less, the authority of the Great CREATOR Himself.

Now the first peculiarity of the Fathers' teaching on this head

¹ Comp. St. Amb. Hex. vi. 8; ii. 7.

§ vi. 5, 6. having been shown to be their jealousy of the merely scientific use of the external world, the next appears to be their instinctively substituting the mystical use in its room ; not a merely *poetical*, or a merely *moral*, but a *mystical*, use of things visible ; according to the exposition of the word *mystical* just above given.

(5.) To state the matter somewhat differently: If we suppose Poetry in general to mean the expression of an overflowing mind, relieving itself, more or less indirectly and reservedly, of the thoughts and passions which most oppress it :—on which hypothesis each person will have a Poetry of his own, a set of associations appropriate to himself for the works of nature and other visible objects, in themselves common to him with others :—if this be so, what follows will not perhaps be thought altogether an unwarrantable conjecture ; proposed, as it ought, and is wished to be, with all fear and religious reverence. May it not, then, be so, that our Blessed LORD, in union and communion with all His members, is represented to us as constituting, in a certain sense, one great and manifold Person, into which, by degrees, all souls of men, who do not cast themselves away, are to be absorbed? and as it is a scriptural and ecclesiastical way of speaking, to say, CHRIST suffers in our flesh, is put to shame in our sins, our members are part of Him ; so may it not be affirmed that He condescends in like manner to have a Poetry of His own, a set of holy and divine associations and meanings, wherewith it is His will to invest all material things? And the authentic records of His will, in this, as in all other truths supernatural, are, of course, Holy Scripture, and the consent of ecclesiastical writers.

(6.) It may be as well here to anticipate an objection, not unlikely to occur on first meeting with the above statement. How, it may be asked, are we to know, whether any particular image in an ancient Christian writer be properly mystical, or merely moral or poetical? the momentary flight of some pious fancy, the edifying analogy observed by some impressive teacher, or a true token from the CREATOR of all things, given to our senses, of some truth which He would fix in our hearts? Any given image, on the face of it, may be either of these three: how are we to distinguish, with any certainty, the one from the other?

Now, in the first place, the objection proceeds on the unhappy § vi. 7.
and untenable supposition, that the truth, if we can at all approach it, must be clear and plain to us throughout, and leave nothing unaccounted for. Surely there may be in the remains of Antiquity a human and a Divine Mysticism, without our being always, or even generally, able to draw the exact line between the two. We ourselves may be unworthy to decypher the writing, or our age may have lost the key to it, and yet we may be sure that it is, in part at least, a communication from the Source of Truth : and the fact may be most desirable for us to know, were it only that we might learn reverence in our way of dealing with the subject.

Is there not something analogous in the case of Holy Scripture itself? We have reason to think that the personal character and circumstances of the several inspired writers was permitted to influence them, more or less, in their style and mode of composition. But where, and how far, we can have no exact knowledge. It is seldom, if ever, given us to determine, what images were suggested to any Prophet or Apostle by his own ordinary experience, and what were immediately prompted by the HOLY GHOST.

If this does not hinder our using the Scriptures to edification, no more need the other prevent our profiting by the imagery of the Fathers, in our mode of considering the visible and external world.

(7.) In effect, however, universal consent will carry us further in this matter, as in many others, than we should be apt beforehand to imagine. There is a wonderful agreement among the Fathers, in the symbolical meanings, which they assign to most of the great objects in nature ; such an agreement as completely negatives the supposition of the whole having sprung from mere poetical association. It were against all calculation of probabilities, that so many writers, of various times, nations, and tempers, and in such different lines of life, should either light on the same set of figures independently of one another, or coincide in imitating any one who had gone before them with no special authority ; more especially, as many of the symbols are far from possessing, at first sight, that exquisite poetical fitness, which would be required, regarding the whole as a matter of taste ; on the con-

§ vi. 8. trary, not a few of them are blamed, by the disparagers of Antiquity, on this very account, that they are so forced, overstrained, and irrelevant, and what classical judges might perhaps call ψυχρά.

Thus they complain, not perceiving that the fact on which they rest, if it were granted, tends on the whole to make us suppose a higher origin for the imagery in question, than any man's poetical or imaginative taste. Such writers, for example, as St. Ambrose or St. Cyprian, St. Chrysostom, or St. Gregory Nazianzen, who evince in their remains the most vivid sense of poetical delicacy and beauty;—when we find them all concurring in the use of symbols, such as have now been described, must we not suppose that they drew from a common source, and were guided in their selection by something deeper than imaginative delight in the beauties of nature, and in the exercise of their own ingenuity?

(8.) The same may be said of the hypothesis (if such should occur to any one) which would make these allusions of the old writers *merely moral*; i. e. so many analogies or similitudes *selected by themselves*, from the course of human life or external nature, to render some truth or precept more forcible and vivid. I do not deny that such analogies occur; especially when they are employed, as by St. Basil and St. Ambrose, in their *Hexaëmeron* before mentioned, in descanting on the works of Creation. For example, we may take St. Basil's account of a mode which the gardeners had of correcting the insipid wateriness of certain fruits.

“¹Some plant the wild figs close to the cultivated: others bind the fruit of the forest fig to the mild and cultivated sort, and so heal its insipidity, the juice of the wilder having the effect of keeping the other from melting and falling away. Would you know what this riddle, presented to you by nature, signifies? That we should often do well to resort even to those who are aliens from the faith, and from them assume a kind of steady vigour, for the performance of good works. I mean, should you see any one either living as a heathen, or separated from the

¹ *Hexaëm. v. 7. t. i. 47. C. Ed. Bened. 1721.*

Church by perverse heresy, yet behaving soberly and observing discipline generally in his moral conduct, do thou draw more strictly the bands of thine own goodness, and so become like the fruitful fig-tree, gathering energy to itself from the presence of its wild kindred, so as both to stay its fruit from falling, and cherish it more effectually to its full size." § vi. 8.

It is easy to see that St. Basil produces this particular parable as an invention of his own, claiming no particular authority for it. And this I call the *moral* way of symbolizing natural objects.

At the same time, it may appear from the phrase, *τί σοι τὸ παρὰ τῆς συκῆς αἶνιγμα βούλεται*; that he was speaking as one himself aware, and among persons who made no question, that every part of nature has its appropriate αἶνιγμα, if we could but find it out. Now this was an opinion which St. Basil was little likely to frame for himself, through excessive indulgence to his own fancy, since he of all the Fathers most earnestly protests against the unrestrained use of allegory. We must then conclude that the sacramental or symbolical view of nature which he implies in the last-mentioned clause, had been received by him as an acknowledged truth, not struck out as a speculation of his own.

In other places indeed he avows it more distinctly : *e. g.* where he speaks of the heavenly bodies¹ : "If the heaven is vast beyond the measure of human understanding, what mind then shall have power to trace out the nature of the invisible things? If the sun, which is subject to decay, is so fair, so large, so swiftly moving, yet so regular in fulfilling its courses,—being both for magnitude proportioned to the universe, so as not to exceed the due relation to the whole system, and for beauty a sort of clear eye to nature, the very ornament of all creation,—if I say this be a sight of which one can never have too much, what must He be for beauty, who is the Sun of Righteousness! If the blind have a loss in not beholding this our sun, how great is the sinner's loss in being deprived of the TRUE LIGHT." Of this epithet, True, thus applied, more will be said by and by ; I will

¹ Hexaëm. vi. l. t. i. 50. E.

§ vi. 9, 10. but suggest here, that on consideration it may possibly be found to involve the whole theory here contended for.

In the next paragraph, St. Basil speaks thus of the heavenly bodies in general: "As the fire is one thing and the lamp another, the one properly having power to enlighten, the other made to conduct the light according to our needs; so were the lights of heaven now framed as a vehicle for that purest and unmingled and immaterial light. Even as the Apostle calls certain, 'Lights in the world,' although the True Light of the world is other than they;—such as that by participation of It the Saints became lights of the souls whom they disciplined, delivering them from the gloom of ignorance:—so also in the creation was this visible sun, stored with that brightest light, by the MAKER of all, and kindled in the world."

These, and similar divine parables, so to call them, are evidently introduced in somewhat of a different tone from that before quoted about the cultivation of figs, which was introduced expressly and formally as a new thing; whereas these assume a certain familiarity, on the hearer's part, with the symbolical imagery.

(9.) If one were to call these latter, of the sun and stars, examples of a symbolical or sacramental view of nature, it would perhaps be no improper mode of expressing the fact here intended; viz. that the works of God in creation and providence, besides their immediate uses in this life, appeared to the old writers as so many intended tokens from the ALMIGHTY, to assure us of some spiritual fact or other, which it concerns us in some way to know. So far, therefore, they fulfilled half at least of the nature of sacraments, according to the strict definition of our Catechism: they were pledges to assure us of some spiritual thing, if they were not means to convey it to us. They were, in a very sufficient sense, *Verba visibilia*.

(10.) This relation of things sensible to spiritual, appears to be indicated by St. Irenæus, who is the rather to be quoted on such a subject, because he seems to be unsuspected of Platonism, or any like forms of opinion, such as are supposed to have biassed the Alexandrian school. He states as follows the

analogy between God's visible dealings with us, and His invisible dispensations. § vi. 10.

"The WORD was made the dispenser of the FATHER's grace for the profit of men, on account of whom He made so many arrangements; on the one hand shewing God to man, on the other presenting man to God; on the one hand maintaining the invisibility of the FATHER, lest at any time man should become a contemner of God, and that he might always have something to reach after and advance towards; on the other hand, manifesting God to the sight of men by many arrangements, lest man, falling altogether away from God, should cease to be. For the glory of God is a living man, but the life of man is the vision of God. And if that manifestation of God which is by the creature, supplies life to all things living upon the earth, much more that manifestation of the FATHER, which is by the WORD, supplies life to those who have the sight of God¹."

This sentiment seems to warrant us in extending to the whole creation the maxim which occurs repeatedly in Irenæus, as concerning the Old Testament. "Nihil enim otiosum, neque vacuum signo, apud Deum." The occasions, indeed, on which this saying is introduced, belong either to the types of the Law, or the history of the Patriarchs. But the saying itself has a proverbial air which gives it a much wider reference. It may seem to answer to that deep sentiment, which appears to run through the philosophical works of St. Augustin, and which he has himself expounded in the Book *de Libero Arbitrio*, II. 41.

"As the whole life of the body is the soul, so the happy life of the soul is God. . . And in so much as it is granted us to rejoice in those true and certain goods, gleaming upon us even while yet in this dark journey, consider whether this be not what is written concerning wisdom; . . . 'she will shew herself to them cheerfully in the way, and meet them with every kind of Providence:' i. e. which ever way thou turnest thyself, she speaks to thee by certain traces which she hath impressed upon her works, and when thou slippest back to external things,

¹ P. 333. Ed. Grab.

§ vi. 10. recalls thee by the very forms of those external things. So that whatsoever delights thee in the body, and allures thee by the bodily senses, thou mayest perceive to be according to certain *numbers*; and inquiring its origin, 'mayest return into thyself, and understand that whatever reaches thee by the bodily senses, cannot be to thee an object of approbation or the contrary, except thou hast within thee certain laws of beauty, to which thou mayest refer whatever seems outwardly fair to thee."

Then, having given instances in the works of nature and of art, in the beauty of motion and of form, and in the science itself of numbers, gradually tracing all to their mysterious origin, God revealing Himself by His Word or Wisdom, he breaks out¹ into the following beautiful admonition :

" Woe to those who forsake Thee their guide, and go astray in Thy footsteps; who love Thy beckonings instead of Thee, and forget what Thou intimatest by them, O Wisdom, most delectable light of the purified spirit. For never dost Thou cease to beckon to us, what and how great Thou art, and all beauty in Thy creatures is but so many beckonings of Thine."

Elsewhere, in a vein of stricter argument, he shews how each created thing, in that it is created, is an image or symbol of the Most Holy Trinity.

" All these things then, made as they are by Divine skill, exhibit in themselves both a certain unity, and a certain kind, and a certain order. For whatever of these things exists, is first some one thing, such as are the frames of bodies, and the intellectual powers of souls: next, it is formed according to a certain kind, such as are the figures and qualities of bodies, and the faculties of knowledge or of art, which distinguish souls: lastly, it craves or retains a certain order, to which head belong the weights and positions of bodies, the appetites and delights of souls. It behoves us therefore, looking at the CREATOR, who is understood by the things that are made, to form the idea of a Trinity, whereof in each creature, according as it is meet, is to be seen some trace²."

¹ Ibid. 43.

² De Trin. vi. 12.

(11.) But it is not so much the manner of the Fathers to express § vi. 11.
their principles of interpretation in set statements, as to be continually referring to them, exemplifying them, and variously bringing them out. Now there is no need, of course, to prove the abundance of mystical allusion in the early Christian writers. It is the very point which has most exposed them to the censure of modern schools. But it may be of use to produce some specimens of it, which, if they be fairly selected, and sufficiently explained by the general statement above, may so far afford a presumption in its favour. Perhaps it will be as fair an experiment as any, if we take the two treatises which have been already cited, the *Hexaëmeron* of St. Basil, and that of St. Ambrose: if indeed they can properly be denominated two treatises, the one being in many parts but a free translation of the other.

Their peculiar fitness for such a purpose, lies partly in their subject, and partly in the character of their authors. The subject, the history of creation, was one which put them especially on their guard against excess of symbolizing, to the disparagement of the historical sense; as is proved by St. Basil's earnest and repeated protest, cited before in these papers. His habits of thought were moreover of that severe and scrupulous cast, which would least suffer the imagination to take liberties.

The tendency of St. Ambrose, it may be thought, was rather the reverse of St. Basil's in this respect. But he too has several observations, implying that he dared not indulge his own or his hearers' fancy for mystical expositions, beyond a certain extent. Comparing the literal meaning to simple fare, which it is both charity and good sense to offer, rather than send the guests away hungry; "Elisha," says he¹, "did not blush to set before them barley loaves: and are we ashamed, when we find things thus designated by their simple and proper names, to understand by them simply the things created? We read of Heaven, let us take it to be Heaven: we read of earth, let us understand that earth which bears fruit."

¹ Hex. vi. 6.

§ vi. 12, 13. Ambrose then apologised for abiding so much by the letter: Basil strongly reproved those who were for wandering from it too widely. Concerning each therefore, it is evident, that when they did allow themselves to allegorize, they were proceeding on some principle, not merely pleasing themselves. The one probably would have had more of this sort, the other less, had it not been for the Church's recognised line of interpretation. As it is, they furnish between them a list of symbols, which ranges through no small portion of created nature.

(12.) First, we have the sum of this visible world declared to be an index or token of the invisible. "Some," observes St. Ambrose¹, "understand the word, 'beginning,' in the first verse of Genesis, not in reference to time, but before time: as meaning the chief point, or head, as if one should say in Latin, *summa operis*; heaven and earth being the sum of all visible things. And visible things seem to bear relation, not only to the fitting up of this world, but also to the setting forth of things invisible, and to furnish a sort of argument of the things which are not seen; according to the saying in the Prophet, 'The Heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handywork.' After whom the Apostle, in other words, but in the same sentiment, winds up his discourse, saying, 'That the invisible things of Him are understood by the things which are made.' For we readily think of Him as the Author of angels, and dominations, and powers, by the moving power of whose Word this world, so beautiful, was caused to be out of nothing, not having before existed."

(13.) As to particulars: the arch of the sky² is a canopy spread over the tents and dwellings of the saints. This, in reference to its form: and then, in reference to the material of which the canopy of the tabernacle in the desert was made, the sky again is a scroll, whereon are written "the names of those many, who have attained CHRIST's favour by their faith and devotion; to whom it is said, 'Rejoice, because your names are written in heaven.'"

¹ Hex. i. 16.

² Ibid. 21.

The flight and hovering of birds, again, is a token that there are Powers in heaven above who watch our proceedings in this lower world. Hence a well-known saying of our LORD's is quoted by St. Ambrose¹ as follows: "The birds of heaven do always behold the face of My FATHER which is in heaven.' And the clause, 'Birds around the firmament of heaven,' intimates that the Powers which are in that visible space, behold all things in this region, and have all brought under the observation of their eyes."

§ vi. 13.

The waters flowing into the sea, are the people gathered into the Church of CHRIST². "The water," says St. Ambrose, "knows how to be gathered, how to shrink and flee away, when God gives the word. . . . Let us be like this water, let us recognise one congregation of the LORD, one only Church. . . . To us also it hath been said, 'Let the water be gathered from every valley,' and there hath ensued a spiritual gathering, and one people: the Church hath been replenished from among the heretics and heathens. . . . This is the Church which hath been 'founded upon the seas, and prepared upon the floods.' For upon you it is established and prepared, who, like rivers run down into it, clean from a pure fountain: concerning which it is said, 'The floods have lift up, O LORD; the floods have lift up their voice through the sound of many waters.' And it goes on, 'Wonderful are the swellings of the sea; wonderful is the LORD in His high places.' Good rivers are ye: for ye have drunk of that eternal and full fountain, wherein He flows who saith to you, 'He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture saith, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.'"

In pursuance of this thought, the sound of the sea is the Church service³. "What else is that concert of waves but a kind of concert of the people? For which cause it is a true similitude, which is commonly made of the sea to a Church, first receiving or swallowing by all its porches certain waves of people entering in long array, then in the prayer of the whole congregation sounding as with reflux waves, when in harmony to the

¹ Hex. ii. 15.² Ibid. iii. 2—6.³ Ibid. iii. 24.

§ vi. 14. responsories of the Psalms an echo is made, a breaking of waves, by the chanting of men and women, of virgins and children."

(14.) Herbs again, and flowers, are the life and body of man. "When thou seest¹," says St. Basil, "a blade of grass or a flower, let it guide thee to the thought of human nature, remembering the image of the wise Prophet Isaiah, 'All flesh is grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass.'" But this of course is too obvious to need dwelling on.

Tares and weeds are false principles: not every kind of sin, but wrong and perverse teaching. "Such spurious seeds²," remarks the same St. Basil, "are produced not by any change in the seed-corn, but subsist by an origin of their own, having an appropriate kind. Yea, and they fulfil the image of those who adulterate the doctrines of the Lord, and in no genuine way become disciples of His word, but rather are corrupted by the teaching of the Evil One, yet mingle themselves with the healthful body of the Church."

The smell of flowers is the odour of sanctity. "How great," exclaims St. Ambrose³, "is the beauty of a well-stored field! What fragrance! what sweetness! what satisfaction to those who till it! how impossible to express it worthily, were we to use our own language! But we have certain testimonies from Scripture, wherein we see that the fragrance of a field is compared to the blessing and grace of the Saints; as saith holy Isaac, 'The smell of my son is like the smell of a field.'"

Thorns on roses betoken the sting of pleasant sins, as says St. Basil⁴: "The rose at first beginning was thornless, but afterwards to the beauty of the flower the thorn also was superinduced; that close to the delightfulness of pleasure we might have pain besetting us in every case, remembering sin, on account of which the earth was sentenced to put forth to us thorns and thistles."

Grafting, in its several forms, is moral and devotional improve-

¹ Hexaëm. v. 2. t. i. 41. D.

² Ibid. iii. 26.

³ Ibid. v. 5. p. 44. B.

⁴ Ibid. v. 6. t. i. 45. A.

ment. "Let no one therefore," says St. Basil¹, "as yet living in evil, cast himself away in despair, knowing that as husbandry alters the qualities of plants, so the training of the soul according to virtue is capable of mastering every sort of distemperature." § vi. 15.

The myrica, or tamarisk, is the plant chosen by the Spirit through Jeremiah, as an emblem of a double mind: for "as such persons," says St. Ambrose², "are every where at call, at once professing, with the good, kindness and simplicity, and connecting themselves as closely as possible with the worst of men: so also these shrubs, by a contradictory kind of rule, grow both in watery and in desert places."

The palm is the chosen type of eternal purity. Other ever-greens³—"the olive," for instance, "and the pine—never put off their apparel; yet, however, they often change their leaves, which keep the tree clothed in beauty, not by perpetual continuance, but by uninterrupted succession. But the palm remains ever green by the preservation and enduring, not the changeful succession, of its leaves. The very first which it put forth, it retains without substitution or fresh supply. Do thou then, O man, become like unto it, that to thee also it may be said, 'This thy stature is like unto a palm-tree.' Preserve the verdure of thy childhood, and of that natural innocence, which thou didst receive in the beginning: that, planted as thou art beside the rivers of waters, thou mayest have thy fruit prepared in thy season, and thy leaf may not fall. This verdure of ever-flourishing grace the Church having attained in CHRIST, saith, 'In His shadow I sat down with earnest desire.' This gift of verdure in the first instance the Apostles also received, that as no leaf of theirs could ever fall away, so their very shadow should be the healing of the sick."

(15.) Proceeding to the works of the fourth day, we have another set of well-known symbols. The Sun, the greater light, is our LORD; the Moon, the lesser light, the Church. "'He appointed the moon for certain seasons, and the Sun knoweth his going down.' This place," St. Ambrose tells us⁴, "appears to be commonly understood in a mystical sense con-

¹ Hexaëm. v. 7. t. i. 46, 47.

² Ibid. iii. 69.

³ Ibid. 71.

⁴ iv. 7.

§ vi. 16. cerning CHRIST and His Church : *i. e.* of our LORD's recognising His own death and passion in the body, when He said, ' FATHER, the hour is come, do Thou glorify Thy SON : ' that by such His setting He might give eternal life to all, who till then were oppressed with the setting of perpetual death ; that His Church might have her certain seasons, of persecution, namely, and of peace. For, like the moon, she seems to fail, but fails not indeed. She may be overshadowed, fail she cannot. Thus in persecutions some indeed depart, and cause her to wane, but it is in order to her being replenished by the confessions of martyrs ; and blood shed for CHRIST makes her bright with its triumphs, and her full orb pours forth more abundantly the glory of her devotion and faith. For the moon is subject to a diminution of her light, not of her orb . . . as may be easily seen when the air is pure and transparent." A little after he adds ¹, " This is the true moon, which, from the never-failing light of her brother borrows for herself the lustre of immortality and grace. For the Church shineth not with her own but with our SAVIOUR's light, and draws to herself splendour from the Sun of Righteousness, that her word may be, ' It is no longer I that live, but CHRIST liveth in me.' "

The Saints are stars in this mystical heaven, as we have seen in a passage from St. Basil.

The four quarters of the heaven again have their part in this sacred and universal language. What the east stands for is well known : and St. Ambrose, from a passage in Canticles, tells us that the south is the region of the Church ². " Tell me, Thou whom my soul loveth, where Thou feedest, where Thou abidest in the south : " *i. e.* as he explains it, " in the region of the Church, where righteousness shines forth, where judgment is dazzling as the noon-day, where no shadow is seen, where the days are longer, because the Sun of Righteousness abides in them more continually, as in the summer months." And the east and south being interpreted, we know of course the probable interpretations of the two opposite regions ; which however shall not

¹ Ibid. 32.

² Ibid. 22.

be dwelt on here, as they do not occur in the treatises now under § vi. 16. consideration.

(16.) Of the many instances which might be specified from among the works of the two remaining days, it will be enough only to mention three: two of them remarkable as having been constantly employed, by poets and moralists, to represent some portion of those truths, by association with which the Church has made them Mysteries. St. Basil uses the silkworm as an evidence or token of the Resurrection¹. "You, who disbelieve St. Paul, concerning the change when our bodies shall be raised, what say you on beholding so many of the inhabitants of the air, how they change their forms? As we are told concerning that horned Indian worm, that it first changes into a grub, then goes on and becomes a chrysalis, and neither in this form does it abide, but decks itself with broad and light pinions. When ye women, therefore, sit carding out the produce of their work, I mean the threads which the Seres export to us for the manufacture of soft garments, I would have you take it as a manifest hint of the Resurrection, and not disbelieve the change which Paul announces to all men."

Again, St. Ambrose sanctions the image, now almost trivial among us, of the turtle dove, as representing chaste and holy widowhood. "The Law of God," says he², "hath selected the turtle as a gift of chaste and pure sacrifice. In fact, when our LORD was circumcised, this was the offering: 'a pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons.' For this is the true sacrifice of CHRIST: bodily chastity, and spiritual grace. Chastity is associated with the turtle, grace with the pigeon. For it is said that when the turtle has been widowed by the loss of her proper mate, she refuses to pair any more . . . See how great is the grace of widowhood, which is honoured even in birds."

One instance more may be mentioned, taken from among quadrupeds. The wolf is with St. Ambrose, as in holy Scripture, the appropriate symbol of the Evil One, wasting the Church or besetting it. Upon this he observes (assuming common notions to be true)³: "If a wolf sees a man before he is seen, the sight

¹ viii. 8. t. i. 78. E.

² v. 62.

³ vi. 26, 27.

§ vi. 17. takes away the man's voice ; but if he feel that the man saw him first, it takes away his fierceness, and he is unable to give chase. . . . Do beasts then know how to seek what shall profit them ; and art thou, O man, ignorant of thy proper helps ? Knowest thou not how to take away the courage of the Adversary, that as a wolf seen first he may not escape thee, that thine eye may discern his perfidy, and thou mayest be beforehand with him, and stay the course of his words,—blunt his audacity and sharpness of disputation. Whereas, if he anticipate thee, he takes away thy voice. . . . Again, if a wolf rise up against thee, take a stone, and he flies. Thy stone [of defence] is CHRIST. Betake thee to CHRIST, and the wolf flies, nor shall he be able to confound thee." Thus even popular and legendary sayings, on matters at first sight farthest from religion, were made to convey high lessons, and remind men of sacred duties.

(17.) Perhaps this exemplification of the mystical use of all God's works, in the order of their creation, may be not unfitly crowned with mention of that Image of God, which, as St. Augustin explains, both in his books on the Trinity and in the City of God, man bears in his mind, even in every thought of it. Thus he speaks, in the later and more highly finished of the two works just mentioned :—after pointing out how in all His creatures, and especially in the threefold division of knowledge, which even Gentile Philosophy acknowledged, God had left covert traces of the FATHER who made all, the SON by whom all were made, the HOLY SPIRIT, or impersonated goodness, for whom all were made ;—he proceeds to say ¹ : "And we even within ourselves acknowledge a certain image of God, even of that most High Trinity, at unspeakable distance indeed, yet such, that nothing among God's creatures is by nature more akin to Him ; and we expect yet a new creation, to bring it very near to Him by resemblance also. For, first, we are : secondly, we are conscious of being : thirdly, we delight in this our being and consciousness . . . ² These three we hold for certain of our own ; we trust not for them to other people's testimony ; we ourselves feel them present, and discern them by an inward and most infallible kind of sight."

¹ De Civ. Dei, xi. 26.

² Ibid. § 28.

“ Because therefore we are men, made after the image of Him § vi. 18.
 who created us, to whom appertains True Eternity, Eternal
 Truth, Love both Eternal and True ; and He is the very Trinity,
 Eternal, and True, and Beloved, neither confounded, nor sepa-
 rated : in those things of course which are beneath us, feeling as
 we do, that they neither could at all exist, nor be contained under
 any idea, nor either seek or maintain any order, except they were
 made by Him who in the highest sense Is, in the highest sense is
 Wise, in the highest sense is Good : let us trace out His foot-
 steps, so to call them, impressed on all the things which He
 hath made, though on some more, on some less ; but in ourselves
 contemplating the Image of Him, even as that younger son in
 the Gospel, let us arise and return to ourselves, in order that we
 may return to Him, from whom by transgression we had with-
 drawn ourselves. There our being shall no longer incur death ;
 nor our knowledge, error ; nor our love, disappointment ¹.”

(18.) Yet further: as the soul of man appears to be, in this sense,
 an image of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity, so his body
 is divinely adapted to the expression of the several virtues and
 graces, which God would new-create in him. St. Ambrose, in
 the end of his treatise so often referred to, has worked out this
 idea in considerable detail.

“ The Forehead is an image of the soul,” he says ², “ speaking
 in the countenance ; it is a sort of ground or tablet of Faith, on
 which day by day the Name of the Lord is inscribed and retained ³.”

Again, alluding to the Kiss of Peace in the Holy Communion ⁴,
 “ By the Lips,” says he, “ Piety and Charity are pledged, the
 faithful affection of entire love is expressed.”

Again ⁵: “ The Hand is that whereby we both work and dis-
 pense divine mysteries : by the name whereof the Son of God
 did not scorn to be designated, where David says, ‘ Thy right
 Hand, O Lord, hath wrought mightily : Thy right Hand, O Lord,
 hath exalted me.’ ” Thus he makes the Hand the symbol of ac-
 tive devotion.

¹ De Civ. Dei, § 28.

² Hex. vi. 58.

⁴ Ibid. 68.

³ i. e. when people cross themselves.

⁵ Ibid. 69.

§ vi. 19, 20. Lastly, the Foot by the same statement¹ expresses humility and diligent obedience.

(19.) Upon these examples, taken collectively, one or two observations may be made.

First, It will have been seen that the great majority of them, the most important, and those of which the writers speak most positively, are gathered out of Holy Scripture itself; a circumstance which singly would afford some presumption, that in the rest of their imagery, not so immediately Scriptural, they did not altogether indulge their own private fancies.

Again: if the figures used by any writer appear at first sight irreconcilable with those used by another, or by himself elsewhere: this also may be paralleled in Scripture, and in both will generally admit of explanation, by tracing the original allusion a little farther back. *E. g.* Water, as is well known, is the *οἶκεῖον*, the choice image, both in Scripture and in the Fathers, to express God's HOLY SPIRIT communicated to His Church. But St. Ambrose, as we have seen, makes the same waters the emblem of CHRIST's people flowing into the Church: as St. Cyprian² had done before him, where he teaches that the water in the Eucharistical cup is the token of the Christian people. But these two meanings are not inconsistent, if we conceive the Blessed SPIRIT to be graciously identifying Himself with the people whom He sanctifies; representing the change wrought in them as so entire, that henceforth they, the whole being of each of them, may be considered as effects and gifts from Him. Or, if no such explanation occurred, still the incongruity would not be greater than that which is found in the different applications of this same symbol of water in the Holy Scripture itself: on comparing, *e. g.* that living Water, which represents the Un-speakable Gift, with the waters on which the mystical Babylon sate, representing "nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues."

(20.) Thirdly, It may seem strange that some of these mystical allusions should be grounded on fable, not on fact: that to the

¹ Ibid. 74.

² Ep. 63. p. 153, 154. Ed. Fell.

Phoenix¹, for example, and to the conception of the Vulture² § vi. 21. without a mate (which is alleged in association with the Immaculate Conception). And the scorn is inexpressible, with which the old ecclesiastical writers, from St. Clement of Rome downwards, have been visited, among modern critics, on this ground especially.

But in the first place, these supposed facts, many of them, are brought forward not merely as providential intimations of mysterious Truths, but as arguments also from analogy, to silence gainsayers. St. Clement, for example, says in effect, "You believe this history of the Phoenix; why should a resurrection be thought incredible by you?" It is clear that the force of this depends not on the absolute truth of the statement, but on its general acceptance by those to whom he was addressing himself.

Further; this also is one of those topics on which objectors had need look well to themselves, lest they find that unawares they have been dealing irreverently with the undoubted Word of God. What are we to make, on their principle, of the inspired direction, to go to the ant, consider her ways, and imitate her forethought, now that it appears to be held among naturalists, that the common notion of that insect's frugality is no better than a common error³? Whatever account can be given of that passage in Scripture, may be given, apparently, of like allegations, now found erroneous, in the writings of the Fathers.

(21.) Lastly, no doubt a considerable number of the above cited instances of Mysticism in things visible, will appear to some very cold, strained, and unnatural. Of these, however, not a few will be found, on closer examination, to be no more than developments, applications, or extensions, of imagery authorized by Scripture itself, or by the Universal Church. And even where that cannot be made to appear, it is dangerous surely so to assume the contrary, as to indulge any light disrespectful thoughts of such similitudes or associations, or of the writers who pointed them

¹ S. Ambrose, Hex. v. 79. S. Clem. Rom. Ep. 1. 25.

² S. Ambr. v. 64, 65.

³ Kirby and Spence, Introd. to Entomology, vol. ii. 46.

§ vii. 1,2. out ; considering how many such things may unquestionably be found in God's own Word, which, if we lighted upon them in any other book, we should be tempted to treat with the same kind of disrespect. Here, as in every part of our patristical studies, it may be well to bear in mind the dream of Jacob, that we may not to our fear and shame have to awake by and by, and say, "Surely the Lord was with us in so many places, betokened by so many of His creatures, and we knew it not, but treated the thought unworthily."

§ vii. *Warrant of Scripture for the Mystical View of things natural.*

(1.) Enough, it is presumed, has been said on this subject, so far as mere illustration of the fact goes. The store of examples which has been adduced from two brief treatises only, the one by St. Basil, the other by St. Ambrose, on the six days' work of creation, must be enough to shew any attentive student, that if the Fathers were wrong in this matter, they were most perseveringly and obtrusively wrong. If the principle of Mystical Interpretation be at all an unhealthy symptom, it is so, not as a local evil, but as a constitutional taint.

But it will be the object of this section to give some reasons for believing, that such use of external things was intended by the ALMIGHTY from the beginning of the Creation ; reasons taken from Scripture, and to be illustrated perhaps hereafter by the apparent ways of God's Providence, in preparing mankind for Gospel Truth.

(2.) First, then, attention is desired to the use of the word ἀληθινός, *True* ; in the New Testament. It will be found very significant, and to some may appear almost decisive, on the point now under consideration.

Careful readers, of the Epistle to the Hebrews more especially, must have noticed how the things of the Christian Dispensation, as distinct from those of the Jewish, are characterized by this epithet, ἀληθινά. Thus our Σανίτουρ is designated as τῶν ἀγίων λειτουργός, καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, "a Minister of the Sanctuary, and of the *True* Tabernacle." And afterwards the holy places made with hands are spoken of as merely ἀντίτυποι

τῶν ἀληθινῶν, "Figures of the True¹." The word has evidently a relative signification: it implies the substance in opposition to the shadow; answering perhaps most exactly to "real" in the language of the present day. And this agrees well enough with the classical use of it: *c. g.* in Aristotle's *Ethics*²: "To be well and rightly framed by Nature towards the pursuit of the best end, must be, if such a thing exist, ἡ τελεία καὶ ἀληθινὴ εὐφύα, perfect and real excellence of Nature:" implying evidently that there were spurious qualities, claiming that name improperly. And again, in the same author³, "In our reasonings on practical matter, general statements are κοινότεροι, 'more comprehensive,' but particular ones are ἀληθινώτεροι, 'have more of reality in them.'" So Demosthenes speaks of φίλοι ἀληθινοί, "true friends⁴," and Polybius⁵ of ἀληθινὴ παιδεία, "true discipline," as opposed to pretences of extraordinary warmth of affection, or skill in training.

Such also will be found to be the force of the word in the LXX. answering most frequently to the Hebrew substantive מִן הַאֱמֻנָה: such in the same usage as the substantive ἀλήθεια, which, by the confession of all commentators, more especially in St. John, means the antitype as opposed to the type: "The Word dwelt among us, full of Grace and Truth:" "Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ:" "They that worship Him, must worship Him in Spirit and in Truth:" "Ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall make you free:" "I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life:" "When the Spirit of Truth is come, He shall guide you into all Truth." In all these places, and in others similar to them, the exposition of Theophylact seems to be generally received, "The word, Truth, may be understood by way of contrast to the old figures or types, which were not the Truth, τινες οὐκ ἦσαν ἀλήθεια."

With this notion on our minds of the force of ἀλήθεια and its kindred words, let us proceed to examine such places as the following: "That was the True Light, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, which

¹ Heb. viii. 2; ix. 24.

² iii. v. 17.

³ Ibid. ii. vii. 1.

⁴ *c. i.* 113, 27. Ed. Reiske.

⁵ *I. i.* 2.

§ vii. 2 lighteneth every man that cometh into the world : " I am the True Vine, ἡ ἀμπελος ἡ ἀληθινὴ—and My FATHER is the Husbandman : " " Moses gave you not that Bread from Heaven, but My FATHER giveth you the True Bread from Heaven : τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινόν : " " If ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous Mammon, who will commit to your trust the True Riches ? " τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν δώσει ; " who will give you that which is real and true, not merely pretence and shadow ? "

On these and the like places it seems natural to inquire, If the mention of the True Sanctuary, the True Tabernacle, the True Holy Place, leads us to think of those particulars, at least in the Jewish economy and ritual, as shadowy and typical of things far more real, far more perfect than themselves : does not the mention of the True Vine, the True Light, the True Riches, tend in the same manner to encourage a notion, that the external and visible objects, so referred to, have their counterpart in a world out of sight, wherein things exist in some manner secret to us, but as much more substantial and excellent than the mode of their being here, as the things of the Gospel and Church of CHRIST are better than those of the Law and Tabernacle of Moses ? As it was not possible for a thoughtful believing person, having once heard of the True Tabernacle, to consider that which stood in the wilderness as any other than an unreal figure of the true ; so when the HOLY SPIRIT had spoken to men of the True Light, faithful hearers must have learned thenceforth to have far other and higher associations with this light which we see, than they could have had otherwise. They know that it is now but a faint earthly shadow of a radiance as much more real than itself, as it is purer and more unspeakably glorious. And so of the other instances, in which the same form of speaking is implied.

But further : as the mention of the Sanctuary and Tabernacle, the Ark and certain other particulars, must of course lead reflecting minds, even without further information, to the surmise, that in regard likewise of other points not specified, and in short in its whole range and detail, the Jewish economy was typical of the Christian ; so when the True Light and the True Vine are named, we are naturally carried on to say to ourselves, " What ?

the whole scheme of sensible things be figurative? What, if all *αἰσθητὰ* answer to *νοητὰ* in the same kind of way as these which are expressly set down? What, if these are but a slight specimen of one great use which ALMIGHTY GOD would have us make of the external world, and of its relation to the world spiritual?"

Certainly the form itself of speaking, with which these symbols are introduced, would seem to imply some such general rule: "That was the True Light;" "I am the True Vine;" "who will give you the True Riches?" taking for granted in a manner the fact, that there was somewhere in the nature of things a true counterpart of these ordinary objects,—a substance, of which they were but unreal shadows;—and only informing us in each case, with authority, what that counterpart and substance was.

Should it further appear, that among those to whom the Scriptures were addressed, there existed a feeling or opinion, call it poetical or philosophical, or let it have been a mere popular fancy, that such a connexion as this language seems to point to really exists between the worlds visible and invisible; the argument for the proposed interpretation of the word *ἀληθινόν* would seem to be so far strengthened. We may reason here as about real possession by Dæmons. The more popular the opinion, the less likely, surely, to find countenance in the language of inspiration, if it were an error.

Now it would seem, that to one large class at least, of those to whom the writings of St. John were at first addressed,—the Hellenistical Jews of Alexandria,—this doctrine of correspondence between things seen and unseen was familiar and very acceptable.

(3.) But not to pursue this topic further at present; let it be considered, whether there are not, on the face of Scripture itself, other obvious appearances in its favour. In the first place, there is the broad fact, that the revealed oracles deal so largely, I had almost said so unreservedly, in symbolical language taken from natural objects: and next, what is equally obvious, that the chosen vehicle for the most direct divine communications has always been that form of speech, which most readily adopts and invites such imagery; *viz.* the Poetical. These are undeniable

§ vii. 3.

- § vii. 3. and surely most significant circumstances, and hardly to be accounted for by the sayings of those, who would reduce all Mysticism to the mere workings of human fancy. Let us reflect, distinctly and at large, on each of them.

And first, as to the symbolical language of Scripture, is there not something very striking, to a thoughtful reverential mind, in the simple fact of such language occurring there at all? This is not meant of merely metaphorical and figurative language, expressing one human and temporal matter by another; but the case intended is, when truths *supernatural* are represented in Scripture by visible and sensible imagery. Consider what this really comes to. The Author of Scripture is the Author of Nature. He made His creatures what they are, upholds them in their being, modifies it at His will, knows all their secret relations, associations, and properties. We know not how much there may be, far beyond mere metaphor and similitude, in His using the name of any one of His creatures, in a translated sense, to shadow out some thing invisible. But thus far we may seem to understand, that the object thus spoken of by Him is so far taken out of the number of ordinary figures of speech, and resources of language, and partakes thenceforth of the nature of a Type.

For what is it, wherein our idea of a Scriptural Type differs from that of a mere illustration or analogy? It appears to lie chiefly in these two things: first, that the event or observance itself, to which we annex the figurative meaning, was ordered, we know, from the beginning, with reference to that meaning: next, that the ideas having been once associated with each other, by authority of God's own Word, reverential minds shall never thereafter be able to part with that association; the sign will to them habitually prove a remembrance and token of the thing signified: and this also must have been intended in the first sanctioning of the type, being the inevitable result, in all minds that fear God, and watch for the signs of His presence. Thus Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, for example, had it been related only by Josephus, might well have been used by way of similitude or comparison to illustrate the sacrifice of God's only begotten Son, on the same mountain, two thousand years after: but it is not clear that we could have positively called it a Type.

That which warrants us in doing so, is the constant interpretation of the Church, confirming the thought which would naturally enter into good and considerate hearts on reading of it in the Scriptures. § vii. 4.

Now let us transfer this notion of a Type, from historical events related in Scripture, to such allusions as are now in question—allusions to the works of nature, and the outward face of things. There also the same distinction is clearly conceivable. Let an uninspired poet or theologian be never so ingenious in his comparisons between earthly things and heavenly, we cannot build any thing upon them; there is no particular certainty, much less any sacredness in them: but let the same words come out of the mouth of God, and we know that the resemblance was intended from the beginning, and intended to be noticed and treasured up by us; it is therefore very nearly the case of a Type properly so called.

We read, for example, that CHRIST “was the True Light which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world.” This, perhaps, in some part of its sense, might be an image not unlikely to have occurred to an earthly orator, and we might have profited by it, as expressive and edifying, and there would be an end:—but now we are informed by it, that even in the first creation of the material light, God had respect to this our spiritual Light; the one was designedly formed to be an image of the other; and such an image as believers should recognise, having their attention drawn to the resemblance by the Word of God Himself. May we not then apply the same term in this case as in the former, and may we not say that the Light visible is a *natural* Type of God manifesting HIMSELF by His SON, as Isaac on the mountain was an *historical* Type of our LORD yielding HIMSELF to the depth of the Cross?

(4.) Now if there were in the Book of God but one such image taken from the works of nature, it might cause in thoughtful minds a serious apprehension, that other cases might exist, of a like intended resemblance between the worlds visible and invisible, though none of them were as yet clearly and expressly declared to us. Our natural tendency to express things unseen by what we see, would seem to have acquired a real though

§ vii. 5. slight sanction and warrant from above : and we might without irreverence begin to speculate (if the word may be used,) on other possible associations and mysterious meanings.

Indeed we should be almost driven to such speculations, in the case supposed, of earthly and heavenly Light: The idea of Light necessarily implies that of its opposite, Darkness ; and naturally, to beings framed and conditioned as we are, it implies also the ideas, of morning and evening, sun, moon, and stars, shadow and sunshine, twilight increasing and decreasing, and many others : for all which, many would be inclined to imagine counterparts in the spiritual world, after they had been once made aware that the Light itself was intended to be typical.

Now, on further examination of the Scriptures, they would find these their anticipations verified. They would find that as Light was the regular symbol of Him, by whom the FATHER is manifested, who is God of God, LIGHT of LIGHT, the WORD who hath declared the Invisible ; so is the Sun in the heavens the scriptural token of the WORD Incarnate, "coming forth as a bridegroom out of His chamber, and rejoicing as a Giant to run His course." They would find the condition of the world without CHRIST represented as "darkness covering the earth, and gross darkness the people ;" the dawns of His manifestation, when incarnate but yet unborn, compared to the morning twilight or "dayspring from on high : " and the severe trials and apparent failures of the faith, which are to be expected even under the Gospel dispensation, these they would find compared to an evening twilight, endeavouring to prevail, but overcome by the sun which never sets : as we read, "At evening time there shall be light."

Other passages would shew them the Moon as the chosen emblem of mortal imperfect human nature, reflecting more or less of the Light which flows from CHRIST, less in the Synagogue, more in the Church of the New Testament : and again the stars, as lesser lights, Patriarchs, Apostles, Bishops, such as are any how employed in turning many to righteousness. Eclipses, rainbows, and other phenomena might be added.

(5.) But if the one idea of light and darkness, with their various relations and modifications, were found thus, from beginning to

end, allegorized, not by our imaginations, but by Scripture itself; § vii. 6.
—one might reasonably conclude the like in the case also of the other great and leading parts and attributes of the material world: one might without presumption infer details and particulars, where express Scripture gave only the general and comprehensive statement. Thus if we only found the Church called generally the Vineyard of the Lord, His pleasant field, and the like, we might reason on the processes of cultivation, the marks of a good or unwholesome stock, the tokens of wrath and favour; though we nowhere read such parables as those of Isaiah and our Lord, developing the idea with authority.

If one of two contraries were clearly symbolical, the other would be understood to be so likewise: if good seed and noble vines are God's obedient and accepted ones, there would be no need to tell us that weeds and thorns and tares are the children of the Wicked One.

Where two things are by nature inevitably and inseparably related to each other, if Scripture give us the spiritual force of the one, it should seem hardly possible to avoid inferring that of the other. Thus if God's regenerate ones, taken separately, are as good seeds cast into the ground, the loaf which comes of that good seed, stands naturally for the same persons formed into one Church or company: an imagination proved to be a verity by the double offering sanctioned in God's law, first of ears of corn, afterwards of consecrated loaves—and this, (to anticipate another part of our subject) is an example of the manner in which God's ancient ritual gives apparent sanction to the symbolical use of things natural.

(6.) Now considering to what an extent nature (so to speak,) delights in pairs, and groupings, and relations; how "one thing," as the son of Sirach observes, is every where "set against another;" how impossible it is to find an object single and uncombined with all others, or to limit the extent of the associations and connexions, which manifest themselves one after another, when we set about tracing any one of the works of creation, through all its influences and aspects on the rest; it ought not perhaps to seem over strange, if the symbolical and

- § vii. 7. mystical use of any one thing were thought to imply the possibility at least of a similar use and bearing in all things.

And this presumption will evidently be strengthened, as the instances which Holy Scripture furnishes multiply, and as we find, on more and more acquaintance with it, that its typical allusions are more developed, and come out on its surface, as stars meet the eye more abundantly, when we continue gazing for any time on what seemed at first merely a space of open sky. St. Augustin appears to have been particularly gifted with the power of discerning this kind of holy imagery. It is really wonderful, as one reads his descants, on the Psalms more especially, how many allusions he detects and brings out, with more or less ingenuity in the particular instance; so that it must require, one would think, a mind prepossessed altogether with dislike of the principle of Mysticism, not to be carried away with him. But even without stopping to discern these more latent allusions, it should seem that on the very surface of Scripture so many of the chief visible objects are invested with spiritual meanings, that to affirm the same of the whole world of sense ought not to sound too hard a saying. The symbols which are mentioned are almost enough to make up between them "a new heaven and a new earth," and to complete the proof, that "the first heaven and the first earth" are to be regarded both generally and in their parts, as types and shadows of those which are out of sight.

On this head there appears something instructive in the circumstance that the phrase just referred to, "a new heaven and a new earth," occurs both in the Old and in the New Testament at the very conclusion of a great body of Prophecy¹, in the course of which the imagery of the visible world has been, one may say, unreservedly employed to represent the scenes and transactions of the invisible one. That is, after the devout mind has been accustomed in detail to associations of that kind, comes in the most comprehensive phrase that could be employed, apparently confirming, by the CREATOR's authority, the view of creation, thus become familiar. Perhaps it adds something to the argument.

¹ Isaiah lxx. 17; Rev. xxi. 1.

that in the second instance the phrase occurs within a few sentences of the conclusion of the whole Bible. § vii. 8.

(7.) Nominalists however of various classes are ready enough with their solutions of these appearances. They say, "it is the imperfection of language ; the ALMIGHTY Himself condescending to employ human words and idioms, could no otherwise convey ideas of the spiritual world, than by images and terms taken from objects of sense." Or again, "it is the genius of Orientalism : if God vouchsafed to address the men of any particular time or country, he would adopt the modes of speech suited to that time and country." Or "the whole is mere poetical ornament, the vehicle of moral or historical truth, framed to be beautified and engaging in its kind, in mere indulgence to the infirmity of human nature."

But as to the particular point in question, would it not be enough to say, in answer to all these statements together, that even if granted in fact, they fail as explanations? since the question would immediately occur, Who made Language, or Orientalism, or Poetry, what they respectively are? Was it not One, who knew beforehand that He should adopt them one day, as the channel and conveyance of His truth and His will to mankind? Surely, reason and piety teach us, that God's providence prepared language in general, and especially the languages of Holy Scripture, and the human styles of its several writers, as fit media through which His supernatural glories and dealings might be discerned : and if they be so formed as necessarily to give us notions of a certain correspondence between the supernatural and the visible, we can hardly help concluding that such notions were intended to be formed by us ; except there be some direct text, or strong analogy of faith, against it.

(8.) It is not very easy to see what is gained by the very rigorous mode of interpretation, which some would apply to the phraseology of the Bible. Illustrations, they say, and analogies, are never to be pressed a hair's breadth further than the least which the context itself, and the turn of the reasoning or sentiment, makes absolutely necessary. We must never be contented till we have exhausted them, as nearly as possible, of all superna-

- § vii. 2. tural meaning : just as the same people count it an axiom, that in historical narratives there must be as few miracles, and in Church ceremonies as few sacraments, as may be.

These rules hardly approve themselves to natural piety, which is ever anxious to trace God as near at hand as it can, alike in His words and in His works. Neither do they well agree with the manner in which the Old Testament is commented on in the New, nor with the sort of expansion and development in detail, which subsequent passages not seldom furnish, of an idea only just thrown out at first. In short, it seems equally absurd to say, on the one hand, that the minimum of mystical sense is always to be preferred, as it would be on the other, always to be trying to extract as much of it as ever we can :—equally absurd, and perhaps not quite so reverential. Surely it will always be a question of degree, not so much how far each sensible image has *some* spiritual meaning, as how far we are able to extract that meaning with any sort of certainty or satisfaction ; saving, as was just now said, the analogy of faith and the truth of other Scriptures. Certainly there is no very obvious reason why we should incline to the defect, rather than the excess in this matter.

(9.) Waving, however, these remarks, which would seem to render all attempts of the kind nugatory, let us see how the Bible imagery will accommodate itself to the particular theories above mentioned, of those who would resolve it into mere accidents of language. First, if the whole were mere necessity, arising out of the imperfection of human speech ; or if it were oriental boldness of phrase, or poetical ornament ; the symbols would probably be more varied than we find them to be : the same external object would not so constantly occur, to express the same invisible thing, through so large a collection of compositions, so widely differing in style and tone. As to the imperfection of human speech, we all feel every hour how it causes us to modify and alter our images : we take the best symbol which occurs at the time, but we use it in a kind of restless unsatisfied way, like persons aware that it is not simply the best ; and by the time we need it again, we have lighted very likely on something far truer

and more vivid : and thus, we go on in conversation or in writing, § vii. 10. improving or marring our imagery, as the case may be, but still letting it be felt that it is by no means fixed and unchangeable.

Again, as to poetical ornament, variety and versatility of resource is obviously a great ingredient of that sort of excellency : to be always resorting to the same similitude or analogy would rather of course betray want of skill or power.

The third solution, that of Orientalism, may seem at first sight to be more satisfactory as to this particular circumstance, of the same figure constantly repeated. Granting, however, that the literature of the Eastern nations is in some respects, like their manners, more fixed and monotonous than ours, and accordingly, that it uses to express things out of sight by a certain uniform imagery, suggesting the notion of a settled and understood allegory : yet in the first place, we know not how far this literature may have been originally modelled on the Hebrew Scriptures, instead of their taking any tone from some previous form of it, the very existence of which, after all, is but conjectural. Next, such a statement would put in a stronger light the fact of that kind of style having been adopted by the HOLY GHOST, whereby its symbolical words would seem to be raised to the rank of Divine Hieroglyphics, so to call them. And thirdly, except we suppose such a foundation of truth in them, it seems hard to explain the sanction given to them by the writers of the New Testament, using as they did a language, and applying themselves (St. Paul and St. Luke especially) to a condition of literature and society, well nigh the opposites of what this theory supposes to have existed in Asia and the East.

The fixedness therefore of the Scriptural Imagery does not appear to be sufficiently accounted for by any criticism of this kind : but it is accounted for, if we suppose the material world originally constructed with a view to the sacred analogies which this symbolical alphabet of Scripture (if we may so denominate it) suggests.

(10.) But here an objection occurs, of no small moment. The fact may perhaps be denied, that the symbols of Scripture are so fixed and regular, as this part of our argument supposes. And the authority of St. Augustin may be appealed to, who seems to lay

§ vii. 10. down a rule at first sight inconsistent with it. "Because," says he¹, "there are a variety of ways in which one thing may appear to resemble another, we are not to imagine it a set-rule, 'Whatsoever in any one place any thing has stood for in the way of simile, that we are always to account its signification.' For the image of leaven has been employed by the Lord Himself, both in the way of reproof, as when He said, 'Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees,' and in the way of praise, when He said, 'The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a woman which hid leaven, in three measures of meal, until the whole was leavened' ¹."

And then he proceeds to point out that this variety of symbolical meaning may be in all degrees. "The same thing may sometimes stand for contraries, here in a good sense, there in a positively bad one, as in the instance just mentioned of leaven; or again, as the lion is the emblem of CHRIST; 'The lion of the Tribe of Judah hath prevailed:' and it is the emblem also of the Devil; 'He goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour:' so the serpent, now in a good sense; 'Be ye wise as serpents;' and now in a bad one; 'The serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty:'—Bread, in a good sense; 'I am the living Bread, which came down from Heaven;' and in a bad one, 'Bread eaten in secret is pleasant.' And there are many other such.

"Now of these which I have mentioned, the signification is not doubtful: because, our object being to exemplify, none but clear cases could properly be introduced. But there are also some whereof it is doubtful what turn we ought to give them: as, 'In the hand of the Lord there is a cup of pure wine, full mixed.' For here it is doubtful, whether he means the anger of God, stopping short of the last penalty, i. e. not exhausted quite to the dregs; or rather, the grace of the Scriptures passing from Jews to Gentiles, expressing by *Inclinauit ex hoc in hoc*: 'He hath stooped it away from this side, and entirely towards that:' there remaining with the Jews only the outward observances, whereof they have but a carnal understanding: and to this purpose may be, 'The dregs thereof are not emptied.'

"But thirdly," proceeds St. Augustin, "the same thing is sometimes spoken of not absolutely in contrary, but only in diverse meanings; as water signifying both the people:—as we read in the Apocalypse, 'The waters where the whore sitteth are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues:' and the HOLY SPIRIT; whence is that saying, 'Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water:' and so there may be other things here and there, whereof water is understood to be the emblem, according to the context of the places where it occurs."

Thus far St. Augustin: but when his instances come to be examined, it will be found perhaps that his differences of signification may be all reduced to different shades or aspects of the same meaning. The Leaven, whether it be bad or good, equally represents moral impressions silently communicated from one to another: the Lion represents a royal warrior, the Serpent, one who counsels deeply and craftily, be their nature and their cause what it may: Bread is that which satisfies the cravings of the soul, in its healthy or in its diseased state: Wine in God's Hand (the allusion is too sacred to be expressed without fear and hesitation,) may, consistently with the rest of Holy Scripture, be interpreted of the highest and most mysterious of all privileges, which is either life or death as men choose to receive it. Of water in its several meanings we shall speak presently.

(11.) But now, if the expression of different objects by the same symbol, which St. Augustin thus largely illustrates, is reconcilable with the general uniformity of the scriptural imagery, much more the converse of it; I mean when the same object is represented by different symbols. To take the highest and most obvious, and also the most frequent example: our LORD CHRIST in His several offices and relations may be represented by symbols as different from each other as a Lamb and a Lion, the Sun in Heaven and a Vine among trees, a Serpent of brass or a Stone cut out of a mountain: and yet no violence be done to the harmony (so to call it) of the symbolical language: not only because things positively unlike may answer well enough to each other in the way of analogy, and so may represent Him in some one of His relations; but also because it is reasonable to think,

- § vii. 12. that the whole creation can hardly be too large or too various to shadow out His manifold aspects, who is all in all to every one of His creatures.

In the greatest possible variety, whether of objects typified by one symbol, or of symbols typifying the same object, there must still be substantial uniformity, because all point or converge towards Him, His work and His everlasting kingdom : just as all languages, however unlike in sound and structure, must be made up virtually of the same parts of speech, having to express the same mental processes, and the same external world.

(12.) With regard then to both grounds of scruple, we may thankfully acquiesce in the practical rule of St. Augustin¹. "When from the same words of Holy Writ not one single meaning, but two or more occur to our minds ; though we know not what was in the mind of him who wrote the words, there is no danger, if it can be shown from other passages of the Holy Scriptures that either one of these senses is in harmony with the truth ; provided always that the person engaged in searching out the Divine Words make this his object, to come at the meaning of the author, by whose agency the HOLY GHOST wrought out this Scripture. Either this, I say, he must attain, or he must frame some other meaning out of those words, not opposed to the right faith, providing himself with authority from some other portion of God's Word. For possibly the author himself saw the same meaning in the passage we wish to explain ; and certainly, at least, the SPIRIT of GOD, who by him composed those words, foresaw that it would occur to the reader or hearer ; nay, He took care that it should occur, seeing that it also, by hypothesis, rests on the truth. For what larger or more abundant provision could have been made by Divine care in the authoritative words of God, than for the same words to be capable of more acceptations than one, other sayings no less Divine testifying to the same, and demanding our approbation for them?"

Thus far St. Augustin ; and it seems well worth consideration, whether there be not somewhat in the ordinary experience of

¹ De Doct. Chr. iii.38.

us all, to confirm his view, high and transcendental as it is. Consider how very differently the same words sound in our ears, according to our different moods of mind ; how much more meaning we find, not only in a text of Scripture, but in a chance passage of a book or a stray remark of a friend, when we recall it by and by, more seriously than at first we listened to it ; nay, and how much beyond what we suspected we discover occasionally in our own words, uttered perhaps at first by instinct, we hardly knew how : so that not only are we always uncertain whether any two persons receive exactly the same impression—the same moral impression, that is,—from any given words, but even whether to the same person the same ideas are conveyed by them twice. And yet there is truth and definite meaning in the words so spoken, although they go so much deeper with one man than they do with another. Surely then it ought not to seem strange that the words of the Most HIGH, spoken with full knowledge of the thoughts of all who should read or hear them, should be intended to give out more or less of signification according to our preparation of heart ; and that, in that sense, their meanings should be even infinite in number and variety. It is only the fact which our own experience suggests, applied to the case of those sayings which are inspired.

Again ; we know well that our good and serious moods are those, in which we most surpass ourselves in our apprehension of deep and grave sayings ; and what is this in effect, but St. Augustin's remark, " That practice strengthened by the exercise of piety—*usus pietatis exercitatione roboratus*—will greatly aid us in coming to a true signification ?" Well is it for those, who are able to confirm this, from the help which they have found in pure imaginations, and rightly tuned affections, rather than contrariwise, from the hindrance they have brought on themselves by indulging base and frivolous fancies. But in one way or the other, we must all more or less have experienced it.

(13.) Further, one may conceive a person arguing, that this view is dangerous and apt to unsettle foundations, making all doctrines subjective rather than objective ; true to the individual, not true

§ vii. 13. in themselves. There is obviously danger of this; but here too the experience we have appealed to will help us. Great as the interval may be between one man and another in their understanding of a given passage,—or between our own ordinary perception of it, and that which we enjoy when our thoughts are most elevated and refined,—yet these variations are all within certain limits: the imagery tends all in the same general direction, though some go never so much deeper, higher, wider, than others: just as we do not question the real significance of words, or the existence of coloured objects, because we are not sure that the shades of meaning or of colour are quite the same to any two different minds. The Catholic Faith, the Mind of CHRIST testified by His universal Church, limits the range of symbolical interpretation both in Scripture and in nature: the Protestant watchword, *Verbum Dei*, must be made primitive by the constant addition, *Verbum Deus*: or, as St. Augustin again expresses it, “We that are made the Body of CHRIST, let us not fail to recognise our own voice in the Psalms and other Scriptures:” our own voice, because it is the Voice of Him in whom we are all made one. “CHRIST,” he proceeds, “wheresoever in those Books, wheresoever in those Scriptures I am journeying and panting for breath, in that sweat of our face which is part of our sentence as men,—CHRIST is there, openly or secretly to meet and refresh me. It is He Himself, who, by the very difficulty which I sometimes have in finding Him, inflames my longing, so that what I do find of His I may eagerly suck in, and retain to my soul’s health, absorbed in my very joints and marrow.” And, “In reading the Scriptures, he only, who finds no pleasure in these holy manifestations of CHRIST, is turned unto fables, not enduring sound doctrine.” In other words, the analogy of faith, CHRIST set before us in the Creeds of the Church, will give a fixedness and reality to our symbolical interpretations, how wide soever in other respects the latitude and variety which seems to be allowed in them.

It need only just be mentioned that the apparent double or manifold senses of a great portion of the Prophecies, and the

manner in which the New Testament generally *accommodates*, § vii. 14. as it is called, texts from the Old, obviously harmonize with what has been advanced out of St. Augustin on this head.

(14.) Closely connected with this topic, of the *fixedness* of the sacred symbols, is what may be called their *complexity*; the manner in which, not seldom, the primary and simple ones among them are varied and combined; as letters are combined into syllables, words, and sentences, retaining each somewhat of their original sound: or rather, as those compound derivatives which are made up of significant terms, each term modified, not changed, in its import. To take an example, than which none can be more holy and venerable, none, as it may seem, more unquestionable. The appropriate symbol of the HOLY SPIRIT is, as the name implies, *Breath*—the *Breath* of the FATHER and the SON, omnipresent, all powerful: and hence it is sometimes represented by the air or wind, as in our LORD's well known words to Nicodemus, and when the disciples on the day of Pentecost heard a sudden sound as of a rushing mighty wind; and His function as the LORD and Giver of Life is represented by the gift of respiration to living things. "God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul;" and "when He letteth His breath go forth, they are made; and He reneweth the face of the earth."

But breath has not only in it air, but moisture; and this condensed is first clouds, then drops of rain, then water gushing out in springs, or flowing in rivers; or in a way of approach yet more silent and invisible, dew: and all these are scriptural emblems of the HOLY SPIRIT in its several aspects and relations. The overshadowing and guiding cloud, in which as well as in the Red Sea, the Israelites were baptized unto Moses, was a token, we know from St. Paul, of the descent of the regenerating SPIRIT of CHRIST, with a hovering, brooding motion, like that of a dove, first on our LORD Himself, then on each of His Members at their baptism: its appearing over the Tabernacle in glory, and filling both it and the Temple, prefigured the warmth and brightness of the heavenly COMFORTER, diffusing Itself over the whole Church at once, and entering into every

§ vii. 14. corner of the new-born soul : the descent of a cloud in rain or dew, is the SPIRIT communicating Himself in gifts and sanctifying graces ; becoming (if one may so speak,) water for the nourishment of our souls, as He was air to give them life ; according to that verse in the Psalm, "Thou, O LORD, sentest a gracious rain upon Thine inheritance, and refreshedst it when it was weary : " and it may be that the express words of the HOLY GHOST are compared to distinct drops of rain, and His silent promptings to the dews, more ærial and impalpable. So Moses, "My doctrine," my set and formal instructions, "shall drop as the rain ; my speech," my incidental hints and whispers, "shall distil as the dew."

The fountains again and depths of pure water, gushing out for our purification and refreshment, how or from whence we know not, except that we are sure they are originally derived from above,—these are the HOLY GHOST in His larger communications of baptismal, sacramental grace ; opening fountains in the hard dry heart of man, which seem to belong to it, but are entirely the gatherings of His rain. And this image is kept up even to the final description of the Church's glory ; where, as it should seem, the goings forth of the COMFORTER are typified by "a pure river of water of life, *proceeding* out of the throne of GOD and of the LAMB," with the Tree of Life growing beside it for the healing and quickening of the nations. And indeed all that is said in every part of the Scriptures, concerning the righteous as trees of the LORD's planting, the Church as His vineyard, the wicked as corrupt and wild plants,—in itself one of the plainest and most abundant of all the sources of scriptural parables,—combines wonderfully well with the thought of air and water, as emblems of the life-giving, sanctifying Breath of the MOST HIGH.

On the other hand, as the Breath of GOD thus becomes water, to cherish, and refresh, and cleanse those souls which have not forfeited the Divine Life, so in It's severer influences, either to purify or consume, (for purgation is partial consuming,) It becomes fire from heaven : first to try, and prove, and refine, every man's work here ; next, utterly to destroy and

waste what shall be found vile and refuse hereafter. Thus He § vii. 16.
who is a consuming fire, and who had so shewn Himself on Mount Sinai, and on so many other occasions when the ungodly were to perish at His presence; HE made His coming known by cloven tongues like as of fire, when that flame was to be kindled which CHRIST came to send upon the earth: and we have an awful notice given, that it is "the Breath of the LORD," which "as a stream of brimstone, kindles" the fire which is "ordained of old" and "prepared for the devil and his angels."

Thus remarkably does the one idea of the Breath of the LORD, followed up and variously combined with others, explain almost all the principal symbols used in Scripture to denote the influences and operations of the HOLY SPIRIT of GOD. Surely the Ancient Church was justified in thinking that analogies, so uniformly kept up, and at the same time so elaborate and complex, were intended for something beyond mere poetical ornament. When, with hearts and memories full of Scripture, they looked out on Nature and her operations, they could not but be conscious that the lessons which they had read and heard were perpetually coming before them in what they saw: and how was it possible for them to help believing that the association was providential and divine; they who were accustomed to behold God's hand in far lesser and more ordinary things?

(15.) Besides, they found this kind of correspondence repeatedly taken for granted and reasoned on in the Holy Scripture itself. Did they not see how St. Paul works out in the minutest detail the notion of the Church being the Body of CHRIST? how he teaches us to deduce from it our every day duties and relations to each other? And could they doubt that all this was intended, in the first formation of the human body, by Him who caused all things to be for the Church's sake? In these analogies unfolded by St. Paul, and still more strikingly in our LORD's Parables, they would perceive the principle sanctioned, and the means afforded, of spiritualizing all the chief objects and processes of which common life, and the world of sense, are made up: and they would think themselves justified in reverently carrying on these analogies, according to their skill, to other points of detail, not expressly mentioned in Scripture.

§. vii. 15. As an example, take St. Augustin's comment on an exquisite pastoral image in the Song of Solomon. He is not, observe, reasoning in proof of our principle,—that was always taken for granted by the Fathers,—but he is descanting on the beauty and usefulness of it. "Why," he asks¹, "is the hearer less delighted, when he is told literally of holy and perfect men, whose life and conduct are the means, whereby CHRIST'S Church separates those who come to her from all superstitions, and unites them, imitating the good which they see, to her own body, which same good and faithful and true servants of God have cast off the burthens of the world, and have drawn near to the Holy Laver of Baptism, and going up from thence, are now, through the quickening SPIRIT, bearing the fruit of both kinds of love, the love of God and of our neighbour:—why is it, I say, that the literal statement of these things affords less satisfaction to the hearer, than if one expound to the same effect that verse in the Song of Songs, where it is said to the Church, receiving praise under the similitude of a beautiful woman, 'Thy teeth are like a flock of sheep even shorn, which are gone up from the washing, which every one of them bear twins, and there is none barren among them?' Certainly the instruction one receives is in substance no more, than in listening to the former statement, made as it was in the most literal words, without the support of this similitude. And yet there is, I know not how, an additional pleasure in contemplating those saints, when I see them, *quasi dentes Ecclesie*, cutting off men from their native errors, and transferring them in a manner into the substance of her body, divided into morsels, and champed, and their hardness mollified. Again, I recognise with great delight the sheep newly shorn, their earthly burthens, as fleeces, deposited, and going up from the bath, i. e., from baptism. I see how they all bring forth twins, the two commandments, namely, of love; and not one of them is barren of that holy fruit."

This, it will be observed, is produced by St. Augustin himself as a specimen of the mode of interpretation, which the Church in his time received undoubtingly, as the true mind of the

¹ De Doctr. Christ. ii. 7.

SPIRIT : and whatever may be thought of the particular instance, § vii. 16, 17. many will feel that there is both piety and probability in such a mode of using the riches of Scripture and of Nature, mutually to illustrate and bring out each other ; and will see in this eager profuse way of heaping simile upon simile, something not unlike St. Paul's own manner of passing rapidly, even in the gravest arguments, from one analogy to another more or less connected with it : as from the seed changed in the ground to the difference between earthly bodies and heavenly ; and again, from the unequal magnitude of the stars to the inequality of the Saints in glory. There is no discrepancy between the tone of the Apostles and that of the Church in after ages, in respect of their both assuming, clearly and deliberately, a certain correspondence, intended by the **CREATOR**, between the material and spiritual worlds.

(16.) Something perhaps is added to this argument by the manner in which our **LORD**'s own example teaches us to take up and use proverbial sayings. " Lift up your eyes and look unto the fields, for they are white already unto the harvest ;" " If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry ?" By instructing His disciples to affix a divine sense, an interpretation connected with the things of His kingdom, to familiar household words such as these, He seems to sanction the idea, that there is perhaps nothing so low and trivial in our ordinary life, but a spiritual and heavenly meaning may be found for it. And further, He seems to hint to us, that this correspondence of things seen with unseen, is by no means so high and transcendental a matter, but that it may well be set before the minds even of very simple uneducated Christians—the class which is most apt to be attracted by proverbs, and to use them frequently.

(17.) Another, and a yet more direct sanction appears to be afforded by the large use of material signs for spiritual objects and processes in the inspired Mosaic Ritual. The whole of that Ritual served, we know, to the example and shadow of heavenly things ; it was made and ordered according to the pattern shewed to Moses in the Mount. Here, therefore, were no inconsiderable number of visible materials, forms, and actions, concerning

§ vii. 18, 19. which the Fathers knew *for certain* that they were intended to express heavenly things,—that their archetypes, so to speak, existed in the Mount. By reference to these they might prove and check, as it were, the conclusions to which they had come in other ways, whether by instinct, or obscure tradition, or examination of scriptural imagery in general, regarding the symbolical meaning of external objects. If they had been led, for example, to conjecture that certain animals—the lamb, the dove, the ox, the goat, and the like—were types, or tokens, in nature, of certain spiritual beings or truths: they would be confirmed in such their conjecture by the use of those animals, or their images, in the worship and furniture of the Tabernacle. The like may be said of plants—the palm, the cedar, the hyssop, and others; of colours, such as white, purple, and scarlet; of materials, linen and woollen; metals and precious stones: the use of any such thing in the divinely ordained ritual would give a new and heavenly significance to any mention of it which might occur in Isaiah and the Psalms, and both together would set it apart for ever, in the judgment of affectionate and imaginative minds, as a natural symbol or sacrament of something out of sight.

(18.) The historical Scriptures too would often furnish additional presumptions to the same effect, by the recorded use of certain materials and forms,—the material of wood for instance, and the form of the Cross,—in God's miraculous and providential dealings. Indeed, so many and so clear are the correspondencies in this kind, that there have not been wanting ingenious writers, both in ancient and modern times, who have explained particular parts, both of the ritual and history, such as the forms of the Tabernacle and Temple, and the construction of the Ark, as physical allegories, designed to represent the system of the world, or the frame of the human body: theories seemingly too wild and strange to be maintained by men of learning and piety, but accounted for, if we may be allowed to suppose that both the history or ritual on the one hand, and the system of the world or of the body on the other, are separate sets of visible symbols shadowing out invisible truths.

(19.) There is one way more, and a very obvious one, in which

the consideration of the Ritual and History might confirm the early § vii. 20.
Christians in their mystical explanations of the whole external world. They found some particulars, both ritual and historical, mystically expounded in the New Testament, and plain implications, almost assertions, that the whole was capable of similar exposition: *e. g.* that "Moses made *all* things according to the pattern shewed him in the Mount;" and that "*all* that befel God's people in the wilderness happened unto them as types of us." When therefore in the natural world they had ascertained a few chief symbols, it was reasonable for them to infer that these too were but specimens, single chords of a harmony to be fully made out hereafter: they would feel like learners of a language, who have picked up the meaning as yet but of a few words here and there, but have no doubt whatever that the whole has its meaning: and perhaps they would think that they found warrant for this in such texts as that of St. Paul to the Romans, "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." This would seem to lay down the principle or canon of mystical interpretation for the works of Nature, as the other texts, just now specified, for the Mosaic ceremonies and the history of the Jews.

(20.) So much for the direct encouragement given in the Bible to the symbolical use of things natural. There is, as was mentioned above, another indirect yet real presumption to the same effect, which at present can only just be adverted to: and that is, the studied preference of *poetical* forms of thought and language, as the channel of supernatural knowledge to mankind. Poetry, traced as high up as we can go, may almost seem to be God's gift from the beginning, vouchsafed to us for this very purpose: at any rate the fact is unquestionable, that it was the ordained vehicle of revelation, until God Himself was made manifest in the flesh. And since the characteristic tendency of poetical minds is to make the world of sense, from beginning to end, symbolical of the absent and unseen, any instance of divine favour shewn to Poetry, any divine use of it in the training of God's people,

§ vii. 20. would seem, as far as it goes, to warrant that tendency; to set God's seal upon it, and witness it as reasonable and true.

Much might be said on this head: but it is enough now to have just indicated it, as one among the many reasons for thinking that Christian Antiquity was far more scriptural, than at first we might be apt to imagine, as in many other things, so in the deep mystical import, which it unreservedly attributes to the whole material world, and to all parts of it.

(To be continued.)

These Tracts are continued in Numbers, and sold at the price of 2d. for each sheet, or 7s. for 50 copies.

LONDON: PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1841.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

The following Works, all in single volumes, or pamphlets, and recently published, will be found more or less to uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in these Tracts :—

Bp. Taylor on Repentance, by Hale.—*Rivingtons.*

Bp. Taylor's Golden Grove.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, with translation.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Pusey on Cathedrals and Clerical Education.—*Roake & Varty.*

Hook's University Sermons.—*Talboys, Oxford.*

Pusey on Baptism (*published separately*).—*Rivingtons.*

Newman's Sermons, 4 vols.—*Rivingtons.*

Newman on Romanism, &c.—*Rivingtons.*

The Christian Year.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Lyra Apostolica.—*Rivingtons.*

Perceval on the Roman Schism.—*Leslie.*

Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions.—*Duncan.*

Dodsworth's Lectures on the Church.—*Burns.*

Cary on the Apostolical Succession.—*Rivingtons.*

Newman on Suffragan Bishops.—*Rivingtons.*

Keble's Sermon on National Apostasy.—*Rivingtons.*

Keble's Sermon on Tradition.—*Rivingtons.*

Memoir of Ambrose Bonwick.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer.—*Rivingtons.*

Law's first and second Letters to Hoadly.—*Rivingtons.*

Bp. Andrews' Devotions. Latin and Greek.—*Pickering.*

Hook's Family Prayers.—*Rivingtons.*

Herbert's Poems and Country Pastor.

Evans's Scripture Biography.—*Rivingtons.*

Le Bas' Life of Archbishop Laud.—*Rivingtons.*

Jones (of Nayland) on the Church.

Bp. Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration.—*Rivingtons.*

Bp. Beveridge's Sermons on the Ministry and Ordinances.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Bp. Jolly on the Eucharist.

Fulford's Sermons on the Ministry, &c.—*Rivingtons.*

Rose's Sermons on the Ministry.—*Rivingtons*.
 A Catechism on the Church.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Russell's Judgment of the Anglican Church.—*Baily*.
 Poole's Sermons on the Creed.—*Grant, Edinburgh*.
 Sutton on the Eucharist.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Leslie on the Regale and Pontificate.—*Leslie*.
 Pusey's Sermon on November 5.—*Rivingtons*.
 Bishop Wilson's Sacra Privata.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 The Cathedral, a Poem.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Palmer's Ecclesiastical History.—*Burns*.

Larger Works which may be profitably studied.

Bishop Bull's Sermons.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Bishop Bull's Works.—*University Press*.
 Waterland's Works.—*Do*.
 Wall on Infant Baptism.—*Do*.
 Pearson on the Creed.—*Do*.
 Leslie's Works.—*Do*.
 Bingham's Works.—*Straker, London*.
 Palmer on the Liturgy.—*University Press*.
 Palmer on the Church.—*Rivingtons*.
 Hooker, ed. Keble.—*Rivingtons*.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

REMARKS ON CERTAIN PASSAGES IN THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

[The corrections in the Second Edition are put in brackets.]

C O N T E N T S.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION	2
§ 1. Articles vi. & xx.—Holy Scripture, and the Authority of the Church	5
§ 2. Article xi.—Justification by Faith only	12
§ 3. Articles xii. & xiii.—Works before and after Justification	14
§ 4. Article xix.—The Visible Church	17
§ 5. Article xxi.—General Councils	21
§ 6. Article xxii.—Purgatory, Pardons, Images, Relics, Invocation of Saints	28
§ 7. Article xxv.—The Sacraments	43
§ 8. Article xxviii.—Transubstantiation	47
§ 9. Article xxxi.—Masses	59
§ 10. Article xxxii.—Marriage of Clergy	64
§ 11. Article xxxv.—The Homilies	66
§ 12. Article xxxvii.—The Bishop of Rome	77
Conclusion	80

Introduction.

It is often urged, and sometimes felt and granted, that there are in the Articles propositions or terms inconsistent with the Catholic faith; or, at least, when persons do not go so far as to feel the objection as of force, they are perplexed how best to reply to it, or how most simply to explain the passages on which it is made to rest. The following Tract is drawn up with the view of showing how groundless the objection is, and further of approximating towards the argumentative answer to it, of which most men have an implicit apprehension, though they may have nothing more. That there are real difficulties to a Catholic Christian in the Ecclesiastical position of our Church at this day, no one can deny; but the statements of the Articles are not in the number; and it may be right at the present moment to insist upon this. If in any quarter it is supposed that persons who profess to be disciples of the early Church will silently concur with those of very opposite sentiments in furthering a relaxation of subscriptions, which, it is imagined, are galling to both parties, though for different reasons, and that they will do this against the wish of the great body of the Church, the writer of the following pages would raise one voice, at least, in protest against any such anticipation. Even in such points as he may think the English Church deficient, never can he, without a great alteration of sentiment, be party to forcing the opinion or project of one school upon another. Religious changes, to be beneficial, should be the act of the whole body; they are worth little if they are the mere act of a majority¹. No good can come of any change which is not heartfelt, a development

¹ This is not meant to hinder acts of Catholic consent, such as occurred anciently, when the Catholic body aids one portion of a particular Church against another portion.

of feelings springing up freely and calmly within the bosom of the whole body itself. Moreover, a change in theological teaching involves either the commission or the confession of sin; it is either the profession or renunciation of erroneous doctrine, and if it does not succeed in proving the fact of past guilt, it, *ipso facto*, implies present. In other words, every change in religion carries with it its own condemnation, which is not attended by deep repentance. Even supposing then that any changes in contemplation, whatever they were, were good in themselves, they would cease to be good to a Church, in which they were the fruits not of the quiet conviction of all, but of the agitation, or tyranny, or intrigue of a few; nurtured not in mutual love, but in strife and envying; perfected not in humiliation and grief, but in pride, elation, and triumph. Moreover it is a very serious truth, that persons and bodies who put themselves into a disadvantageous state, cannot at their pleasure extricate themselves from it. They are unworthy of it; they are in prison, and CHRIST is the keeper. There is but one way towards a real reformation, —a return to Him in heart and spirit, whose sacred truth they have betrayed; all other methods, however fair they may promise, will prove to be but shadows and failures.

On these grounds, were there no others, the present writer, for one, will be no party to the ordinary political methods by which professed reforms are carried or compassed in this day. We can do nothing well till we act "with one accord;" we can have no accord in action till we agree together in heart; we cannot agree without a supernatural influence; we cannot have a supernatural influence unless we pray for it; we cannot pray acceptably without repentance and confession. Our Church's strength would be irresistible, humanly speaking, were it but at unity with itself: if it remains divided, part against part, we shall see the energy which was meant to subdue the world preying upon itself, according to our SAVIOUR's express assurance, that such a house "cannot stand." Till we feel this, till we seek one another as brethren, not lightly throwing aside our private opinions, which we seem to feel we have received from above, from an ill-regulated, untrue desire of unity, but returning to each other in heart, and coming

together to God to do for us what we cannot do for ourselves, no change can be for the better. Till [we][her children] are stirred up to this religious course, let the Church, [our Mother,] sit still; let [her children] be content to be in bondage; let [us] work in chains; let [us] submit to [our] imperfections as a punishment; let [us] go on teaching [through the medium of indeterminate statements,] and inconsistent precedents, and principles but partially developed. We are not better than our fathers; let us bear to be what Hammond was, or Andrews, or Hooker; let us not faint under that body of death, which they bore about in patience; nor shrink from the penalty of sins, which they inherited from the age before them¹.

But these remarks are beyond our present scope, which is merely to show that, while our Prayer Book is acknowledged on all hands to be of Catholic origin, our Articles also, the offspring of an uncatholic age, are, through God's good providence, to say the least, not uncatholic, and may be subscribed by those who aim at being catholic in heart and doctrine. In entering upon the proposed examination, it is only necessary to add, that in several places the writer has found it convenient to express himself in language recently used, which he is willing altogether to make his own. He has distinguished the passages introduced by quotation marks.

¹ "We, thy sinful creatures," says the Service for King Charles the Martyr, "here assembled before Thee, do, in behalf of all the people of this land, humbly confess, that they were the *crying sins* of this nation; which brought down this judgment upon us," i. e. King Charles's murder.

§ 1.—*Holy Scripture and the Authority of the Church.*

Articles vi. & xx.—“ Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation ; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. The Church hath [power to decree (statuendi) rites and ceremonies, and] authority in controversies of faith ; and yet it is not lawful for the Church to [ordain (instituere) any thing that is contrary to God’s word written, neither may it] so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet [as it ought not to decree (decernere) anything against the same, so] besides the same, ought it not to enforce (obtrudere) anything to be believed for necessity of salvation ¹.”

Two instruments of Christian teaching are spoken of in these Articles, Holy Scripture and the Church.

Here then we have to inquire, first, what is meant by Holy Scripture ; next, what is meant by the Church ; and then, what their respective offices are in teaching revealed truth, and how these are adjusted with one another in their actual exercise.

1. Now what the Church is, will be considered below in Section 4.

2. And the Books of Holy Scripture are enumerated in the latter part of the Article, so as to preclude question. Still two points deserve notice here.

First, the Scriptures or Canonical Books are said to be those “of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.” Here it is not meant that there never was any doubt in portions of the Church or particular Churches concerning certain books, which the Article includes in the Canon ; for some of them,—as, for

¹ The passages in brackets (all) relate to rites and ceremonies which are not here in question. [From brackets marking the Second Edition, must be accepted those which occur in quotations.]

instance, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse—have been the subject of much doubt in the West or East, as the case may be. But the Article asserts that there has been no doubt about them in the Church Catholic; that is, at the very first time that the Catholic or whole Church had the opportunity of forming a judgment on the subject, it pronounced in favour of the Canonical Books. The Epistle to the Hebrews was doubted by the West, and the Apocalypse by the East, only while those portions of the Church investigated separately from each other, only till they compared notes, interchanged sentiments, and formed a united judgment. The phrase must mean this, because, from the nature of the case, it can mean nothing else.

And next, be it observed, that the books which are commonly called Apocrypha, are not asserted in this Article to be destitute of inspiration or to be simply human, but to be not canonical; in other words, to differ from Canonical Scripture, specially in this respect, *viz.* that they are not adducible in proof of doctrine. "The other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth not apply them to *establish any doctrine.*" That this is the limit to which our disparagement of them extends, is plain, not only because the Article mentions nothing beyond it, but also from the reverential manner in which the Homilies speak of them, as shall be incidentally shown in Section 11. [The compatibility of such reverence with such disparagement is also shown from the feeling towards them of St. Jerome, who is quoted in the Article, who implies more or less their inferiority to Canonical Scripture, yet uses them freely and continually, as if Scripture. He distinctly names many of the books which he considers not canonical, and virtually names them all by naming what *are* canonical. For instance, he says, speaking of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, "As the Church reads Judith, Tobit, and the Maccabees, without receiving them among the Canonical Scriptures, so she reads these two books for the edification of the people, not for the confirmation of the authority of ecclesiastical doctrines." (*Præf. in Libr. Salom.*) Again, "The Wisdom, as it is commonly styled, of Solomon, and the book of Jesus son of Sirach,

and Judith, and Tobias, and the Shepherd, are not in the Canon.' (*Præf. ad Reges.*) Such is the language of a writer who nevertheless is, to say the least, not wanting in reverence towards the books he thus disparages.]

A further question may be asked, concerning our received version of the Scriptures, whether it is in any sense imposed on us as a true comment on the original text; as the Vulgate is upon the Roman Catholics. It would appear not. It was made and authorized by royal command, which cannot be supposed to have any claim upon our interior consent. At the same time every one who reads it in the Services of the Church, does, of course, thereby imply that he considers that it contains no deadly heresy or dangerous mistake. And about its simplicity, majesty, gravity, harmony, and venerableness, there can be but one opinion.

3. Next we come to the main point, the adjustment which this Article effects between the respective offices of the Scripture and Church; which seems to be as follows.

It is laid down that, 1. Scripture contains all necessary articles of the faith; 2. either in its text, or by inference; 3. The Church is the keeper of Scripture; 4. and a witness of it; 5. and has authority in controversies of faith; 6. but may not expound one passage of Scripture to contradict another; 7. nor enforce as an article of faith any point not contained in Scripture.

From this it appears, first, that the Church *expounds and enforces the faith*; for it is forbidden to expound in a particular way, or so to enforce as to obtrude; next, that it derives the faith *wholly from Scripture*; thirdly, that its office is to educe an *harmonious interpretation* of Scripture. Thus much the Article settles.

Two important questions, however, it does not settle, viz. whether the Church judges, first, at her *sole discretion*, next, on her *sole responsibility*; i.e. first, what the *media* are by which the Church interprets Scripture, whether by a direct divine gift, or catholic tradition, or critical exegesis of the text, or in any other way; and next, who is to decide whether it interprets Scripture rightly or not;—what is her method, if any; and who is her judge, if any.

In other words, not a word is said, on the one hand, in favour of Scripture having no rule or method to fix interpretation by, or, as it is commonly expressed, *being the sole rule of faith*; nor on the other, of the *private judgment of the individual* being the ultimate standard of interpretation. So much has been said lately on both these points, and indeed on the whole subject of these two Articles, that it is unnecessary to enlarge upon them; but since it is often supposed to be almost a first principle of our Church, that Scripture is "the rule of faith," it may be well, before passing on, to make an extract from a paper, published some years since, which shows, by instances from our divines, that the application of the phrase to Scripture is but of recent adoption. The other question, about the ultimate judge of the interpretation of Scripture, shall not be entered upon.

"We may dispense with the phrase 'Rule of Faith,' as applied to Scripture, on the ground of its being ambiguous; and, again, because it is then used in a novel sense; for the ancient Church made the Apostolic Tradition, as summed up in the Creed, and not the Bible, the *Regula Fidei*, or Rule. Moreover, its use as a technical phrase, seems to be of late introduction in the Church, that is, since the days of King William the Third. Our great divines use it without any fixed sense, sometimes for Scripture, sometimes for the whole and perfectly adjusted Christian doctrine, sometimes for the Creed; and, at the risk of being tedious, we will prove this, by quotations, that the point may be put beyond dispute.

"Ussher, after St. Austin, identifies it with the Creed;—when speaking of the Article of our Lord's Descent to Hell, he says,—

"'It having here likewise been further manifested, what different opinions have been entertained by the ancient Doctors of the Church, concerning the determinate place wherein our Saviour's soul did remain during the time of the separation of it from the body, I leave it to be considered by the learned, whether any such controverted matter may fitly be brought in to *expound the Rule of Faith*, which, being common both to the great and small ones of the Church, must contain such varieties only as are generally agreed upon by the common consent of all true Christians.'—*Answer to a Jesuit*, p. 362.

“Taylor speaks to the same purpose: ‘Let us see with what constancy that and the following ages of the Church did adhere to the Apostles’ Creed, as the sufficient and perfect *Rule of Faith*.’—*Dissuasive*, part 2, i. 4, p. 470. Elsewhere he calls Scripture the Rule: ‘That the Scripture is a full and sufficient *Rule* to Christians in faith and manners, a full and perfect declaration of the Will of God, is therefore certain, because we have no other.’—*Ibid.* part 2, i. 2, p. 384. Elsewhere, Scripture and the Creed: ‘He hath, by His wise Providence, preserved the plain places of Scripture and the Apostles’ Creed, in all Churches, to be the *Rule* and Measure of Faith, by which all Churches are saved.’—*Ibid.* part 2, i. 1, p. 346. Elsewhere he identifies it with Scripture, the Creeds, and the first four Councils: ‘We also [after Scripture] do believe the Apostles’ Creed, the Nicene, with the additions of Constantinople, and that which is commonly called the symbol of St. Athanasius; and the four first General Councils are so entirely admitted by us, that they, together with the plain words of Scripture, are made the *Rule* and Measure of judging heresies among us.’—*Ibid.* part 1, i. p. 131.

“Laud calls the Creed, or rather the Creed with Scripture, the Rule. ‘Since the Fathers make the Creed the *Rule of Faith*; since the agreeing sense of Scripture with those Articles are the *Two Regular Precepts*, by which a divine is governed about his faith,’ &c.—*Conference with Fisher*, p. 42.

“Bramhall also: ‘The Scriptures and the Creed are not two different Rules of Faith, but *one and the same Rule, dilated in Scripture, contracted in the Creed*.’—*Works*, p. 402. Stillingfleet says the same (*Grounds*, i. 4. 3.); as does Thorndike (*De Rat. fm. Controv.* p. 144, &c.). Elsewhere, Stillingfleet calls Scripture the Rule (*Ibid.* i. 6. 2.); as does Jackson (vol. i. p. 226). But the most complete and decisive statement on the subject is contained in Field’s work on the Church, from which shall follow a long extract.

“‘It remained to show,’ he says, ‘what is the Rule of that judgment whereby the Church discerneth between truth and falsehood, the faith and heresy, and to whom it properly pertaineth to interpret those things which, touching this Rule, are doubtful. The Rule of our Faith in general, whereby we know it to

be true, is the infinite excellency of God....It being pre-supposed in the generality that the doctrine of the Christian Faith is of God, and containeth nothing but heavenly truth, in the next place, we are to inquire by what Rule we are to judge of particular things contained within the compass of it.

“ ‘ This Rule is, 1. The summary comprehension of such principal articles of this divine knowledge, as are the principles whence all other things are concluded and inferred. These are contained in the *Creed of the Apostles*.

“ ‘ 2. All such things as every Christian is bound expressly to believe, by the light and direction whereof he judgeth of other things, which are not absolutely necessary so particularly to be known. These are rightly said to be the Rule of our Faith, because the principles of every science are the Rule whereby we judge of the truth of all things, as being better and more generally known than any other thing, and the cause of knowing them.

“ ‘ 3. The analogy, due proportion, and correspondence, that one thing in this divine knowledge hath with another, so that men cannot err in one of them without erring in another; nor rightly understand one, but they must likewise rightly conceive the rest.

“ ‘ 4. Whatsoever *Books* were delivered unto us, as written by them, to whom the first and immediate revelation of the divine truth was made.

“ ‘ 5. Whatsoever hath been delivered by all the saints with one consent, which have left their judgment and opinion in writing.

“ ‘ 6. Whatsoever the most famous have constantly and uniformly delivered, as a matter of faith, no one contradicting, though many other ecclesiastical writers be silent, and say nothing of it.

“ ‘ 7. That which the most, and most famous in every age, constantly delivered as a matter of faith, and as received of them that went before them, in such sort that the contradictors and gainsayers were in their beginnings noted for singularity, novelty, and division, and afterwards, in process of time, if they persisted in such contradiction, charged with heresy.

“ ‘ These three latter Rules of our Faith we admit, not because they are equal with the former, and originally in themselves contain the direction of our Faith, but because nothing can be delivered, with such and so full consent of the people of God, as in them is expressed; but it must need be from those first authors and founders of our Christian profession. The Romanists add unto these the decrees of Councils and determinations of Popes, making these also to be the Rules of Faith; but because we have no proof of *their* infallibility, we number them not with the rest.

“ ‘ Thus we see how many things, in several degrees and sorts, are said to be Rules of our Faith. The infinite excellency of God, as that whereby the truth of the heavenly doctrine is proved. The Articles of Faith, and other verities ever expressly known in the Church as the first principles, are the Canon by which we judge of conclusions from thence inferred. The Scripture, as containing in it all that doctrine of Faith which CHRIST the SON of GOD delivered.

The uniform practice and consenting judgment of them that went before us, as a certain and undoubted explication of the things contained in the Scripture. . . . So, then, *we do not make Scripture the Rule of our Faith, but that other things in their kind are Rules likewise*; in such sort that *it is not safe, without respect had unto them, to judge things by the Scripture alone,*' &c.—iv. 14. pp. 364, 365.

“These extracts show not only what the Anglican doctrine is, but, in particular, that the phrase ‘Rule of Faith’ is no symbolical expression with us, appropriated to some one sense; certainly not as a definition or attribute of Holy Scripture. And it is important to insist upon this, from the very great misconceptions to which the phrase gives rise. Perhaps its use had better be avoided altogether. In the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture, it is plain, is *not*, on Anglican principles, the Rule of Faith.”

§ 2.—*Justification by Faith only.*

Article xi.—“That we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine.”

The Homilies add that Faith is the sole *means*, the sole *instrument* of justification. Now, to show briefly what such statements imply, and what they do not.

1. They do *not* imply a denial of *Baptism* as a means and an instrument of justification; which the Homilies elsewhere affirm, as will be shown incidentally in a later section.

“The instrumental power of Faith cannot interfere with the instrumental power of Baptism; because Faith is the sole justifier, not in contrast to *all* means and agencies whatever, (for it is not surely in contrast to our Lord’s merits, or God’s mercy,) but to all other *graces*. When, then, Faith is called the sole instrument, this means the sole *internal* instrument, not the sole instrument of any kind.

“There is nothing inconsistent, then, in Faith being the sole instrument of justification, and yet Baptism also the sole instrument, and that at the same time, because in distinct senses; an inward instrument in no way interfering with an outward instrument, Baptism may be the hand of the giver, and Faith the hand of the receiver.”

Nor does the sole instrumentality of Faith interfere with the doctrine of *Works* being a mean also. And that it is a mean, the Homily of Alms-deeds declares in the strongest language, as will also be quoted in Section 11.

“An assent to the doctrine that Faith alone justifies, does not at all preclude the doctrine of Works justifying also. If, indeed, it were said that Works justify in *the same sense* as Faith only justifies, this would be a contradiction in terms; but Faith only may justify in one sense—Good Works in another:—and this is all that is here maintained. After all, does not Christ only justify? How is it that the doctrine of Faith justifying does not

interfere with our LORD's being the sole Justifier? It will, of course, be replied, that our LORD is the *meritorious cause*, and Faith the *means*; that Faith justifies in a different and subordinate sense. As, then, CHRIST justifies *in the sense* in which He justifies alone, yet Faith also justifies in its own sense; so Works, whether moral or ritual, may justify us in their own respective senses, though in the sense in which Faith justifies, it only justifies. The only question is, *What* is that sense in which Works justify, so as not to interfere with Faith only justifying? It may, indeed, turn out on inquiry, that the sense alleged will not hold, either as being unscriptural, or for any other reason; but, whether so or not, at any rate the apparent inconsistency of language should not startle persons; nor should they so promptly condemn those who, though they do not use *their* language, use St. James's. Indeed, is not this argument the very weapon of the Arians, in their warfare against the SON of God? They said, CHRIST is not GOD, because the FATHER is called the '*Only God*.' "

2. Next we have to inquire *in what sense* Faith only does justify. In a number of ways, of which here two only shall be mentioned.

First, it is the pleading or impetrating principle, or constitutes our *title* to justification; being analogous among the graces to Moses' lifting up his hands on the Mount, or the Israelites eyeing the Brazen Serpent,—actions which did not merit God's mercy, but *asked* for it. A number of means go to effect our justification. We are justified by CHRIST alone, in that He has purchased the gift; by Faith alone, in that Faith asks for it; by Baptism alone, for Baptism conveys it; and by newness of heart alone, for newness of heart is the life of it.

And secondly, Faith, as being the beginning of perfect or justifying righteousness, is taken for what it tends towards, or ultimately will be. It is said by anticipation to be that which it promises; just as one might pay a labourer his hire before he began his work. Faith working by love is the seed of divine graces, which in due time will be brought forth and flourish—partly in this world, fully in the next.

§ 3.—*Works before and after Justification.*

Articles xii. & xiii.—“ Works done before the grace of CHRIST, and the inspiration of His SPIRIT, [‘ before justification,’ *title of the Article,*] are not pleasant to God (*minimè Deo grata sunt*); forasmuch as they spring not of Faith in JESUS CHRIST, neither do they make man meet to receive grace, or (as the school authors say) deserve grace of congruity (*merentur gratiam de congruo*); yea, rather for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin. Albeit good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification (*justificatos sequuntur*), cannot put away (expiare) our sins, and endure the severity of God’s judgment, yet are they pleasing and acceptable (*grata et accepta*) to God in CHRIST, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith.”

Two sorts of works are here mentioned—works before justification, and works after; and they are most strongly contrasted with each other.

1. Works before justification, are done “before the grace of CHRIST, and the inspiration of His SPIRIT.”

2. Works before, “do not spring of Faith in JESUS CHRIST;” works after are “the fruits of Faith.”

3. Works before “have the nature of sin;” works after are “good works.”

4. Works before “are not pleasant (*grata*) to God;” works after “are pleasing and acceptable (*grata et accepta*) to God.”

Two propositions, mentioned in these Articles, remain, and deserve consideration: First, that works *before* justification do not make or dispose men to receive grace, or, as the school writers say, deserve grace of congruity; secondly, that works *after* “cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God’s judgment.”

1. As to the former statement,—to deserve *de congruo*, or of congruity, is to move the Divine regard, not from any claim upon

it, but from a certain fitness or suitableness ; as, for instance, it might be said that dry wood had a certain disposition or fitness towards heat which green wood had not. Now, the Article denies that works done before the grace of CHRIST, or in a mere state of nature, in this way dispose towards grace, or move God to grant grace. And it asserts, with or without reason, (for it is a question of *historical fact*, which need not specially concern us,) that certain schoolmen maintained the affirmative.

Now, that this is what it means, is plain from the following passages of the Homilies, which in no respect have greater claims upon us than as comments upon the Articles :—

“ Therefore they that teach repentance *without a lively faith* in our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, do teach none other but Judas's repentance, as all the schoolmen do, which do *only* allow these three parts of repentance,—the contrition of the heart, the confession of the mouth, and the satisfaction of the work. But all these things we find in Judas's repentance, which, in outward appearance, did far exceed and pass the repentance of Peter. . . . This was commonly the penance which CHRIST enjoined sinners, ‘Go thy way, and sin no more;’ which penance we shall never be able to fulfil, *without the special grace* of Him that doth say, ‘Without Me, ye can do nothing.’ ”—*On Repentance*, p. 460.

To take a passage which is still more clear :

“ As these examples are not brought in to the end that we should thereby take a boldness to sin, presuming on the mercy and goodness of GOD, but to the end that, if, through the frailness of our own flesh, and the temptation of the devil, we fall into the like sins, we should in no wise despair of the mercy and goodness of GOD : even so must we beware and take heed, that we do in no wise think in our hearts, imagine, or believe *that we are able to repent aright, or to turn effectually unto the LORD by our own might and strength.* ”—*Ibid.*, part i. fin.

The Article contemplates these two states,—one of justifying grace, and one of the utter destitution of grace ; and it says, that those who are in utter destitution cannot do anything to gain justification ; and, indeed, to assert the contrary would be Pelagianism. However, there is an intermediate state, of which the Article says nothing, but which must not be forgotten, as being an actually existing one. Men are not always either in light or in darkness, but are sometimes between the two ; they are sometimes not in a state of Christian justification, yet not utterly

deserted by God, but in a state something like that of Jews or of Heathen, turning to the thought of religion. They are not gifted with *habitual* grace, but they still are visited by Divine influences, or by *actual* grace, or rather *aid*; and these influences are the first-fruits of the grace of justification going before it, and are intended to lead on to it, and to be perfected in it, as twilight leads to day. And since it is a Scripture maxim, that "he that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much;" and "to whosoever hath, to him shall be given;" therefore, it is quite true that works done *with* divine aid, and in faith, *before* justification, do dispose men to receive the grace of justification;—such were Cornelius's alms, fastings, and prayers, which led to his baptism. At the same time it must be borne in mind that, even in such cases, it is not the works themselves which make them meet, as some schoolmen seem to have said, but the secret aid of God, vouchsafed, equally with the "grace and Spirit," which is the portion of the baptized, for the merits of CHRIST's sacrifice.

[But it may be objected, that the silence observed in the Article about a state between that of justification and grace, and that of neither, is a proof that there is none such. This argument, however, would prove too much; for in like manner there is a silence in the Sixth Article about a *judge* of the scripturalness of doctrine, yet a judge there must be. And, again, few, it is supposed, would deny that Cornelius, before the angel came to him, was in a more hopeful state, than Simon Magus or Felix. The difficulty then, if there be one, is common to persons of whatever school of opinion.]

2. If works *before* justification, when done by the influence of divine aid, gain grace, much more do works *after* justification. They are, according to the Article, "*grata*," "*pleasing to God*;" and they are accepted, "*accepta*;" which means that God rewards them, and that of course according to their degree of excellence. At the same time, as works before justification may nevertheless be done under a divine influence, so works after justification are still liable to the infection of original sin; and, as not being perfect, "cannot expiate our sins," or "endure the severity of God's judgment."

§ 4.—*The Visible Church.*

Art. xix.—“The visible Church of CHRIST is a congregation of faithful men (*coetus fidelium*), in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to CHRIST’s ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.”

This is not an abstract definition of a Church, but a description of *the* actually existing One Holy Catholic Church diffused throughout the world; as if it were read, “The Church is a certain society of the faithful,” &c. This is evident from the mode of describing the Catholic Church familiar to all writers from the first ages down to the age of this Article. For instance, St. Clement of Alexandria says, “I mean by the Church, not a place, but the *congregation of the elect*.” Origen: “The Church, the *assembly of all the faithful*.” St. Ambrose: “*One congregation, one Church*.” St. Isidore: “The Church is a *congregation of saints*, collected on a certain faith, and the best conduct of life.” St. Augustin: “The Church is *the people of God* through all ages.” Again: “The Church is *the multitude* which is spread over the whole earth.” St. Cyril: “When we speak of the Church, we denote the most holy *multitude of the pious*.” Theodoret: “The Apostle calls the Church the *assembly of the faithful*.” Pope Gregory: “The Church, a *multitude of the faithful* collected of both sexes.” Bede: “The Church is the *congregation of all saints*.” Alcuin: “The Holy Catholic Church,—in Latin, the *congregation of the faithful*.” Amalarius: “The Church is *the people* called together by the Church’s ministers.” Pope Nicolas I.: “The Church, that is, the *congregation of Catholics*.” St. Bernard: “What is the Spouse, but *the congregation of the just*?” Peter the Venerable: “The Church is called a *congregation*, but not of all things, not of cattle, but of *men, faithful, good, just*. Though bad among these good, and just among the unjust, are revealed or concealed, yet it is called a Church.”

Hugo Victorinus : "The Holy Church, that is, *the university of the faithful*." Arnulphus : "The Church is called *the congregation of the faithful*." Albertus Magnus : "The Greek word Church means in Latin convocation ; and whereas works and callings belong to rational animals, and reason in man is inward faith, therefore it is called *the congregation of the faithful*." Durandus : "The Church is in one sense material, in which divers offices are celebrated ; in another spiritual, which is the *collection of the faithful*." Alvarus : "The Church is the *multitude of the faithful*, or the university of Christians." Pope Pius II. : "The Church is the *multitude of the faithful* dispersed through all nations¹." [And so the Reformers, in their own way ; for instance, the Confession of Augsburg. "The one Holy Church will remain for ever. Now the Church of Christ properly is the congregation of the members of Christ, that is, of saints who truly believe and obey Christ ; though with this congregation many bad and hypocrites are mixed in this life, till the last judgment." vii.—And the Saxon : "We say then that the visible Church in this life is an assembly of those who embrace the Gospel of Christ and rightly use the Sacraments," &c. xii.]

These illustrations of the phraseology of the Article may be multiplied in any number. And they plainly show that it is not laying down any logical definition *what* a Church is, but is describing, and, as it were, pointing to the Catholic Church diffused throughout the world ; which, being but one, cannot possibly be mistaken, and requires no other account of it beyond this single and majestic one. The ministration of the Word and Sacraments is mentioned as a further note of it. As to the question of its limits, whether Episcopal Succession or whether intercommunion with the whole be necessary to each part of it,—these are questions, most important indeed, but of detail, and are not expressly treated of in the Articles.

This view is further illustrated by the following passage from the Homily for Whitsunday :—

"Our Saviour CHRIST departing out of the world unto His FATHER, promised

¹ These instances are from Launoy.

His Disciples to send down another COMFORTER, that should continue with them for ever, and direct them into all truth. Which thing, to be faithfully and truly performed, the Scriptures do sufficiently bear witness. Neither must we think that this COMFORTER was either promised, or else given, only to the Apostles, but also to the *universal Church of CHRIST, dispersed through the whole world*. For, unless the HOLY GHOST had been always present, governing and preserving the Church from the beginning, it could never have suffered so many and great brunts of affliction and persecution, with so little damage and harm as it hath. And the words of CHRIST are most plain in this behalf, saying, that 'the SPIRIT of Truth should abide with them for ever;' that 'He would be with them always (He meaneth by grace, virtue, and power) even to the world's end.'

"Also in the prayer that He made to His FATHER a little before His death, He maketh intercession, not only for Himself and His Apostles, but indifferently for all them that should believe in Him through their words, that is, to wit, for His whole Church. Again, St. Paul saith, 'If any man have not the SPIRIT of CHRIST, the same is not His.' Also, in the words following: 'We have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.' Hereby, then, it is evident and plain to all men, that the HOLY GHOST was given, not only to the Apostles, but also to the *whole body of CHRIST's congregation*, although not in like form and majesty as He came down at the feast of Pentecost. But now herein standeth the controversy,—whether all men do justly arrogate to themselves the HOLY GHOST, or no. The Bishops of Rome have for a long time made a sore challenge thereto, reasoning with themselves after this sort: 'The HOLY GHOST,' say they, 'was promised to the Church, and never forsaketh the Church. But we are the chief heads and the principal part of the Church, therefore we have the HOLY GHOST for ever: and whatsoever things we decree are undoubted verities and oracles of the HOLY GHOST.' That ye may perceive the weakness of this argument, it is needful to teach you, first, what the true Church of CHRIST is, and then to confer the Church of Rome therewith, to discern how well they agree together. The true Church is an *universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people*, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, JESUS CHRIST Himself being the head corner-stone. And it hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the Sacraments ministered according to CHRIST's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline. This description of the Church is agreeable both to the Scriptures of God, and also to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, so that none may justly find fault therewith. Now, if you will compare this with the Church of Rome, not as it was in the beginning, but as it is at present, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd; you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the Church, that nothing can be more."

This passage is quoted, not for all it contains, but in that re-

spect in which it claims attention, viz. as far as it is an illustration of the Article. It is speaking of the one Catholic Church, not of an abstract idea of a Church which may be multiplied indefinitely in fact ; and it uses the same terms of it which the Article does of "the visible Church." It says that "the true Church is an *universal* congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people," &c., which as closely corresponds to the *cœtus fidelium*, or "congregation of faithful men" of the Article, as the above descriptions from Fathers or Divines do. Therefore, the *cœtus fidelium* spoken of in the Article is not a definition, which kirk, or connexion, or other communion may be made to fall under, but the enunciation of a fact.

§ 5.—General Councils.

Article xxi.—“General councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the SPIRIT and Word of GOD, they may err, and sometimes have erred, in things pertaining to GOD.”

That great bodies of men, of different countries, may not meet together without the sanction of their rulers, is plain from the principles of civil obedience and from primitive practice. That, when met together, though Christians, they will not be all ruled by the SPIRIT or Word of GOD, is plain from our LORD's parable of the net, and from melancholy experience. That bodies of men, deficient in this respect, may err, is a self-evident truth,—*unless*, indeed, they be favoured with some divine superintendence, which has to be proved, before it can be admitted.

General councils then may err, [*as such* ;—may err,] *unless* in any case it is promised, as a matter of express supernatural privilege, that they shall *not* err ; a case which lies beyond the scope of this Article, or at any rate beside its determination.

Such a promise, however, *does* exist, in cases when general councils are not only gathered together according to “the commandment and will of princes,” but *in the Name of CHRIST*, according to our LORD's promise. The Article merely contemplates the human prince, not the King of Saints. While councils are a thing of earth, their infallibility of course is not guaranteed ; when they are a thing of heaven, their deliberations are overruled, and their decrees authoritative. In such cases they are *Catholic* councils ; and it would seem, from passages which will be quoted in Section 11, that the Homilies recognize four, or even six, as bearing this character. Thus Catholic or Œcumenical Councils are general councils, and something more. Some general councils are Catholic, and others are not. Nay, as even Romanists grant, the same councils may be partly Catholic, partly not.

If Catholicity be thus a *quality*, found at times in general councils, rather than the *differentia* belonging to a certain class of them, it is still less surprising that the Article should be silent about it.

What those *conditions* are, which fulfil the notion of a gathering "in the Name of CHRIST," in the case of a particular council, it is not necessary here to determine. Some have included among these conditions, the subsequent reception of its decrees by the universal Church; others a ratification by the pope.

Another of these conditions, however, the Article goes on to mention, *viz.* that in points necessary to salvation, a council should prove its decrees by Scripture.

St. Gregory Nazianzen well illustrates the consistency of this Article with a belief in the infallibility of Œcumenical Councils, by his own language on the subject on different occasions.

In the following passage he anticipates the Article:—

"My mind is, if I must write the truth, to keep clear of every conference of bishops, for of conference never saw I good come, or a remedy so much as an increase of evils. For there is strife and ambition, and these have the upper hand of reason."—Ep. 55.

Yet, on the other hand, he speaks elsewhere of "the Holy Council in Nicæa, and that band of chosen men whom the Holy Ghost brought together."—Orat. 21.

§ 6.—*Purgatory, Pardons, Images, Relics, Invocation of Saints.*

Article xxii.—“The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons (*de indulgentiis*), worshipping (*de veneratione*) and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing (*res est futilis*) vainly (*inaniter*) invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant (*contradicit*) to the Word of God.”

Now the first remark that occurs on perusing this Article is, that the doctrine objected to is “the *Romish* doctrine.” For instance, no one would suppose that the *Calvinistic* doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, and image-worship, is spoken against. Not every doctrine on these matters is a fond thing, but the *Romish* doctrine. Accordingly, the *Primitive* doctrine is not condemned in it, unless, indeed, the *Primitive* doctrine be the *Romish*, which must not be supposed. Now there *was* a primitive doctrine on all these points,—how far Catholic or universal, is a further question,—but still so widely received and so respectably supported, that it may well be entertained as a matter of opinion by a theologian now; this, then, whatever be its merits, is not condemned by this Article.

This is clear without proof on the face of the matter, at least as regards pardons. Of course, the Article never meant to make light of *every* doctrine about pardons, but a certain doctrine, the *Romish* doctrine, [as indeed the plural form itself shows.]

And [such an understanding of the Article is supported by] some sentences in the Homily on Peril of Idolatry, in which, as far as regards relics, a *certain* “veneration” is sanctioned by its tone in speaking of them, though not of course the *Romish* veneration.

The sentences referred to run as follows :—

“In the Tripartite Ecclesiastical History, the Ninth Book, and Forty-eighth Chapter, is testified, that ‘Epiphanius, being yet alive, did work miracles : and that after his death, devils, *being expelled at his grave or tomb*, did roar.’ Thus you see what authority St. Jerome (who has just been mentioned) and that most ancient history give unto the holy and learned Bishop Epiphanius.”

Again :—

“ St. Ambrose, in his Treatise of the Death of Theodosius the Emperor, saith, ‘ Helena found the Cross, and the title on it. She worshipped the King, and not the wood, surely (for that is an heathenish error and the vanity of the wicked), but she worshipped Him that hanged on the Cross, and whose Name was written on the title,’ and so forth. See both the godly empress’s fact, and St. Ambrose’s judgment at once; they thought it had been an heathenish error, and vanity of the wicked, *to have worshipped the Cross itself, which was embued with our SAVIOUR CHRIST’S own precious blood.*”—*Peril of Idolatry, part 2, circ. init.*

In these passages the writer does not positively commit himself to the miracles at Epiphanius’s tomb, or the discovery of the true Cross, but he evidently wishes the hearer to think he believes in both. This he would not do, if he thought all honour paid to relics wrong.

If, then, in the judgment of the Homilies, not all doctrine concerning veneration of relics is condemned in the Article before us, but a certain toleration of them is compatible with its wording; neither is all doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, images, and saints, condemned by the Article, but only “the Romish.”

And further by “the Romish doctrine,” is not meant the Tridentine [statement], because this Article was drawn up before the decree of the Council of Trent. What is opposed is the *received doctrine* of the day, and unhappily of this day too, or the doctrine of the *Roman schools*; a conclusion which is still more clear, by considering that there are portions in the Tridentine [statements] on these subjects, which the Article, far from condemning, by anticipation approves, as far as they go. For instance, the Decree of Trent enjoins concerning purgatory thus :—“ Among the uneducated vulgar let *difficult and subtle questions*, which make not for edification, and seldom contribute aught towards piety, be kept back from popular discourses. Neither let them suffer the public mention and treatment of *uncertain points*, or such as *look like falsehood.*” Session 25. Again, about images : “ *Due honour and veneration is to be paid unto them, not that we believe that any divinity or virtue is in them, for which they should be worshipped (colendæ) or that we should ask any thing of them, or that trust should be reposed in images,*

as formerly was done by the Gentiles, which used to place their hope on idols."—*Ibid.*

If, then, the doctrine condemned in this Article concerning purgatory, pardons, images, relics, and saints, be not the Primitive doctrine, nor the Catholic doctrine, nor the Tridentine [statement,] but the Romish, *doctrina Romanensium*, let us next consider *what* in matter of fact it is. And

1. As to the doctrine of the Romanists concerning Purgatory.

Now here there *was* a primitive doctrine, whatever its merits, concerning the fire of judgment, which is a possible or a probable opinion, and is *not* condemned. That doctrine is this : that the conflagration of the world, or the flames which attend the Judge, will be an ordeal through which all men will pass ; that great saints, such as St. Mary, will pass it unharmed ; that others will suffer loss ; but none will fail under it who are built upon the right foundation. Here is one [purgatorian doctrine] not " Romish."

Another doctrine, purgatorian, but not Romish, is that said to be maintained by the Greeks at Florence, in which the cleansing, though a punishment, was but a *pœna damni*, not a *pœna sensus* ; not a positive sensible infliction, much less the torment of fire, but the absence of God's presence. And another purgatory is that in which the cleansing is but a progressive sanctification, and has no pain at all.

None of these doctrines does the Article condemn ; any of them may be held by the Anglo-Catholic as a matter of private belief ; not that they are here advocated, one or other, but they are adduced as an *illustration* of what the Article does *not* mean, and to vindicate our Christian liberty in a matter where the Church has not confined it.

[For what the doctrine which is reprobated is, we might refer, in the first place, to the Council of Florence, where a decree was passed on the subject, were not that decree almost as vague as the Tridentine ; viz., that deficiency of penance is made up by *pœnæ purgatoriæ*.]

" Now doth St. Augustine say, that those men which are cast into prison after this life, on that condition, may in no wise be holpen, though we would help them never so much. And why ? Because the *sentence* of God is

unchangeable, and cannot be *revoked again*. Therefore let us not deceive ourselves, thinking that either we may help others, or others may help us, by their good and charitable prayers in time to come. For, as the preacher saith, 'When the tree falleth, whether it be toward the south, or toward the north, in what place soever the tree falleth, there it lieth : ' meaning thereby, that every mortal man *dieth either in the state of salvation or damnation*, according as the words of the Evangelist John do plainly import, saying, 'He that believeth on the SON of GOD hath eternal life ; but he that believeth not on the SON, shall never see life, but the wrath of GOD abideth upon him,'—where is then the third place, which they call purgatory ? Or where shall our prayers help and profit the dead ? St. Augustine doth only acknowledge two places after this life, heaven and hell. As for the third place, he doth plainly deny that there is any such to be found in all Scripture. Chrysostom likewise is of this mind, that, unless we wash away our sins in this present world, we shall find no comfort afterward. And St. Cyprian saith, that, after death, repentance and sorrow of pain shall be without fruit, weeping also shall be in vain, and prayer shall be to no purpose. Therefore he counselleth all men to make provision for themselves while they may, because, when they are once departed out of this life, there is no place for *repentance*, nor yet for satisfaction."—*Homily concerning Prayer*, pp. 282, 283.

Now it [would seem], from this passage, that the Purgatory contemplated by the Homily, was one for which no one will for an instant pretend to adduce even those Fathers who most favour Rome, *viz. one in which our state would be changed*, in which God's sentence could be reversed. "The *sentence of God*," says the writer, "is *unchangeable*, and cannot be revoked again ; there is no place for *repentance*." On the other hand, the Council of Trent, and Augustin and Cyprian, so far as they express or imply any opinion approximating to that of the Council, held Purgatory to be a place for *believers*, not unbelievers, not where men who have lived and *died in God's wrath*, may gain pardon, but where those who have *already* been pardoned in this life, may be cleansed and purified for beholding the face of God. The Homily, then, and therefore the Article [as far as the Homily may be taken to explain it], does not speak of the Tridentine purgatory.

The mention of Prayers for the dead in the above passage, affords an additional illustration of the limited and [relative] sense of the terms of the Article now under consideration. For such prayers are obviously not condemned in it in the abstract, or in every shape, but *as offered to rescue the lost from eternal fire*.

[Hooker, in his Sermon on Pride, gives us a second view of the "Romish doctrine of Purgatory," from the schoolmen. After speaking of the *pœna damni*, he says—

"The other punishment, which hath in it not only loss of joy, but also sense of grief, vexation, and woe, is that whereunto they give the name of purgatory pains, in nothing different from those very infernal torments which the souls of castaways, together with damned spirits do endure, save only in this, there is an appointed term to the one, to the other none; but for the time they last they are equal."—Vol. iii. p. 796.]

Such doctrine, too, as the following may well be included in that which the Article condemns under the name of "Romish." The passage to be quoted has already appeared in these Tracts.

"In the 'Speculum Exemplorum' it is said, that a certain priest, in an ecstasy, saw the soul of Constantius Turritanus in the eaves of his house, tormented with frosts and cold rains, and afterwards climbing up to heaven upon a shining pillar. And a certain monk saw some souls roasted upon spits like pigs, and some devils basting them with scalding lard; but a while after, they were carried to a cool place, and so proved purgatory. But Bishop Theobald, standing upon a piece of ice to cool his feet, was nearer purgatory than he was aware, and was convinced of it, when he heard a poor soul telling him, that under that ice he was tormented; and that he should be delivered, if for thirty days continual, he would say for him thirty masses. And some such thing was seen by Conrade and Udalric in a pool of water; for the place of purgatory was not yet resolved on, till St. Patrick had the key of it delivered to him, which when one Nicholas borrowed of him, he saw as strange and true things there, as ever Virgil dreamed of in his purgatory, or Cicero in his dream of Scipio, or Plato in his Gorgias, or Phædo, who indeed are the surest authors to prove purgatory. But because to preach false stories was forbidden by the Council of Trent, there are yet remaining more certain arguments, even revelations made by angels, and the testimony of St. Odilio himself, who heard the devil complain, (and he had great reason surely) that the souls of dead men were daily snatched out of his hands, by the alms and prayers of the living; and the sister of St. Damianus, being too much pleased with hearing of a piper, told her brother, that she was to be tormented for fifteen days in purgatory.

"We do not think that the wise men in the Church of Rome believe these narratives; for if they did, they were not wise; but this we know, that by such stories the people were brought into a belief of it, and having served their turn of them, the master builders used them as false arches and centries, taking them away when the parts of the building were made firm and stable by authority."—*Jer. Taylor, Works*, vol. x. pp. 151, 152.

Another specimen of doctrine, which no one will attempt to prove from Scripture, is the following :—

"Eastwardly, between two walls, was a vast place of purgatory fixed, and beyond it a pond to rinse souls in that had waded through purgatory, the water being salt and cold beyond comparison. Over this purgatory St. Nicholas was the owner.

"There was a mighty bridge, all beset with nails and spikes, and leading to the mount of joy; on which mount was a stately church, seemingly capable to contain all the inhabitants of the world, and into which the souls were no sooner entered, but that they forgot all their former torments.

"Returning to the first Church, there they found St. Michael the Archangel and the Apostles Peter and Paul. St. Michael caused all the white souls to pass through the flames, unharmed, to the mount of joy; and those that had black and white spots, St. Peter led into purgatory to be purified.

"In one part sate St. Paul, and the devil opposite to him with his guards, with a pair of scales between them, weighing all such souls as were all over black; when upon turning a soul, the scale turned towards St. Paul, he sent it to purgatory, there to expiate its sins; when towards the devil, his crew, with great triumph, plunged it into the flaming pit. . . .

"The rustic likewise saw near the entrance of the town-hall, as it were, four streets; the first was full of innumerable furnaces and cauldrons filled with flaming pitch and other liquids, and boiling of souls, whose heads were like those of black fishes in the seething liquor. The second had its cauldrons stored with snow and ice, to torment souls with horrid cold. The third had thereof boiling sulphur and other materials, affording the worst of stinks, for the vexing of souls that had wallowed in the filth of lust. The fourth had cauldrons of a most horrid salt and black water. Now sinners of all sorts were alternately tormented in these cauldrons."—*Purgatory proved by Miracle*, by S. Johnson, pp. 8—10.

[Let it be considered, then, whether on the whole the "Romish doctrine of Purgatory," which the Article condemns, and which was generally believed in the Roman Church three centuries since, as well as now, viewed in its essence, be not the doctrine, that the punishment of unrighteous Christians is temporary, not eternal, and that the purification of the righteous is a portion of the same punishment, together with the superstitions, and impostures for the sake of gain, consequent thereupon.]

2. Pardons, or Indulgences.

The history of the rise of the Reformation will interpret "the Romish doctrine concerning pardons," without going further. Burnet thus speaks on the subject.

"In the primitive church there were very severe rules made, obliging all that had sinned publicly (and they were afterwards applied to such as had sinned secretly) to continue for many years in a state of separation from the Sacrament,

and of penance and discipline. But because all such general rules admit of a great variety of circumstances, taken from men's sins, their persons, and their repentance, there was a power given to all Bishops, by the Council of Nice, to shorten the time, and to relax the severity of those Canons, and such favour as they saw cause to grant, was called *indulgence*. This was just and necessary, and was a provision without which no constitution or society can be well governed. But after the tenth century, as the Popes came to take this power in the whole extent of it into their own hands, so they found it too feeble to carry on the great designs that they grafted upon it.

"They gave it high names, and called it a plenary remission, and the pardon of all sins: which the world was taught to look on as a thing of a much higher nature, than the bare excusing of men from discipline and penance. Purgatory was then got to be firmly believed, and all men were strangely possessed with the terror of it: so a deliverance from purgatory, and by consequence an immediate admission into heaven, was believed to be the certain effect of it. Multitudes were, by these means, engaged to go to the Holy Land, to recover it out of the hands of the Saracens: afterwards they armed vast numbers against the heretics, to extirpate them: they fought also all those quarrels, which their ambitious pretensions engaged them in, with emperors and other princes, by the same pay; and at last *they set it to sale* with the same impudence, and almost with the same methods, that mountebanks use in venting of their secrets.

"This was so gross, even in an ignorant age, and among the ruder sort, that it gave the first rise to the Reformation: and as the progress of it was a very signal work of God, so it was in a great measure owing to the scandals that *this shameless practice* had given the world."—*Burnet on Article XIV.* p. 190.

Again :—

"The virtue of indulgences is the applying the treasure of the Church upon *such terms* as Popes shall think fit to prescribe, in order to the redeeming souls from purgatory, and from all other temporal punishments, and that for such a number of years as shall be specified in the bulls; some of which have gone to thousands of years; one I have seen to ten hundred thousand: and as these indulgences are sometimes granted by special tickets, like tallies struck on that treasure; so sometimes they are affixed to particular churches and altars, to particular times, or days, chiefly to the year of jubilee; they are also affixed to such things as may be carried about, to Agnus Dei's, to medals, to rosaries, and scapularies; they are also affixed to some prayers, the devout saying of them being a mean to procure great indulgences. The granting these is left to the Pope's discretion, who ought to distribute them as he thinks may tend most to the honour of God and the good of the Church; and he ought not to be too profuse, much less to be too scanty in dispensing them.

"This has been the received doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome since the twelfth century: and the Council of Trent, in a hurry, in its last session, did, *in very general words*, approve of the practice of the Church in this

matter, and decreed that indulgences should be continued; only *they restrained some abuses*, in particular that of *selling them*."—*Burnet on Article XXII.* p. 305.

Burnet goes on to maintain that the act of the Council was incomplete and evaded. If it be necessary to say more on the subject, let us attend to the following passage from Jeremy Taylor:—

"I might have instanced in worse matters, made by the Popes of Rome to be pious works, the condition of obtaining indulgences. Such as was the bull of Pope Julius the Second, giving indulgence to him that meeting a Frenchman should kill him, and another for the killing of a Venetian. . . . I desire this only instance may be added to it, that Pope Paul the Third, he that convened the Council of Trent, and Julius the Third, for fear, as I may suppose, the Council should forbid any more such follies, for a farewell to this game, gave an indulgence to the fraternity of the Sacrament of the Altar, or of the Blessed Body of Our LORD JESUS CHRIST, of such a vastness and unreasonable folly, that it puts us beyond the question of religion, to an inquiry, whether it were not done either in perfect distraction, or, with a worse design, to make religion to be ridiculous, and to expose it to a contempt and scorn. The conditions of the indulgence are, either to visit the Church of St. Hilary of Chartres, to say a 'Pater Noster' and an 'Ave Mary' every Friday, or, at most, to be present at processions and other divine service upon 'Corpus Christi day.' The gift is—as many privileges, indults, exemptions, liberties, immunities, plenary pardons of sins, and other spiritual graces, as were given to the fraternity of the Image of our SAVIOUR 'ad Sancta Sanctorum;' the fraternity of the charity and great hospital of St. James in Augusta, of St. John Baptist, of St. Cosmas and Damianus; of the Florentine nation; of the hospital of the HOLY GHOST in Saxia; of the order of St. Austin and St. Champ; of the fraternities of the said city; of the churches of our Lady 'de populo et verbo;' and all those that were ever given to them that visited these churches, or those which should ever be given hereafter—a pretty large gift! In which there were so many pardons, quarter-pardons, half-pardons, true pardons, plenary pardons, quarantines, and years of quarantines; that it is a harder thing to number them, than to purchase them. I shall remark in these some particulars to be considered.

"1. That a most scandalous and unchristian dissolution and death of all ecclesiastical discipline, is consequent to the making all sin so cheap and trivial a thing; that the horrible demerits and exemplary punishment and remotion of scandal and satisfactions to the Church, are indeed reduced to trifling and mock penances. He that shall send a servant with a candle to attend the holy Sacrament, when it shall be carried to sick people, or shall go himself; or, if he can neither go nor send, if he say a 'Pater Noster' and an 'Ave,' he shall have a hundred years of true pardon. This is fair and easy. But then,

"2. It would be considered what is meant by so many years of pardon, and so many years of true pardon. I know but of one natural interpretation of it;

and that it can mean nothing, but that some of the pardons are but fantastical, and not true; and in this I find no fault, save only that it ought to have been said, that all of them are fantastical.

" 3. It were fit we learned how to compute four thousand and eight hundred years of quarantines, and a remission of a third part of all their sins; for so much is given to every brother and sister of this fraternity, upon Easter-day, and eight days after. Now if a brother needs not thus many, it would be considered whether it did not encourage a brother or a frail sister to use all their medicine, and sin more freely, lest so great a gift become useless.

" 4. And this is so much the more considerable because the gift is vast beyond all imagination. The first four days in Lent they may purchase thirty-three thousand years of pardon, besides a plenary remission of all their sins over and above. The first week of Lent a hundred and three-and-thirty thousand years of pardon, besides five plenary remissions of all their sins, and two third parts besides, and the delivery of one soul out of purgatory. The second week in Lent a hundred and eight-and-fifty thousand years of pardon, besides the remission of all their sins, and a third part besides; and the delivery of one soul. The third week in Lent, eighty thousand years, besides a plenary remission, and the delivery of one soul out of purgatory. The fourth week in Lent, threescore thousand years of pardon, besides a remission of two-thirds of all their sins, and one plenary remission, and one soul delivered. The fifth week, seventy-nine thousand years of pardon, and the deliverance of two souls; only the two thousand seven hundred years that are given for the Sunday, may be had twice that day, if they will visit the altar twice, and as many quarantines. The sixth week, two hundred and five thousand years, besides quarantines, and four plenary pardons. Only on Palm Sunday, whose portion is twenty-five thousand years, it may be had twice that day. And all this is the price of him that shall, upon these days, visit the altar in the church of St. Hilary. And this runs on to the Fridays, and many festivals, and other solemn days in the other parts of the year."—*Jer. Taylor*, vol. xi. p. 53—56.

[The doctrine then of pardons, spoken of in the Article, is the doctrine maintained and acted on in the Roman Church, that remission of the penalties of sin in the next life may be obtained by the power of the Pope, with such abuses as money payments consequent thereupon¹.]

3. Veneration and worshipping of Images and Relics.

That the Homilies do not altogether discard reverence towards relics, has already been shown. Now let us see what they do discard.

" What meaneth it that Christian men, after the use of the Gentiles idolaters, *cap and kneel* before images? which, if they had any sense and gratitude,

¹ " The pardons then, spoken of in the Article, are large and reckless indulgences from the penalties of sin obtained on money payments." 1st ed.

would kneel before men, carpenters, masons, plasterers, founders, and goldsmiths, their makers and framers, by whose means they have attained this honour, which else should have been evil-favoured, and rude lumps of clay or plaster, pieces of timber, stone, or metal, without shape or fashion, and so without all estimation and honour, as that idol in the Pagan poet confesseth, saying, 'I was once a vile block, but now I am become a god,' &c. What a fond thing is it for man, who hath life and reason, to bow himself to a dead and insensible image, the work of his own hand! Is not this stooping and kneeling before them, which is forbidden so earnestly by God's word? Let such as so fall down before images of saints, know and confess that they exhibit that honour to dead stocks and stones, which the saints themselves, Peter, Paul, and Barnabas, would not to be given to them, being alive; which the angel of God forbiddeth to be given to him. And if they say they exhibit such honour not to the image, but to the saint whom it representeth, they are convicted of folly, to believe that they please saints with that honour, which they abhor as a spoil of God's honour."—*Homily on Peril of Idolatry*, p. 191.

Again :

"Thus far Lactantius, and much more, too long here to write, of *candle lighting* in temples *before images and idols* for religion; whereby appeareth both the foolishness thereof, and also that in opinion and act we do agree altogether in our candle-religion with the Gentiles idolaters. What meaneth it that they, after the example of the Gentiles idolaters, *burn incense, offer up gold* to images, *hang up crutches*, chains, and ships, legs, arms, and whole men and women of wax, before images, as though by them, or saints (as they say) they were delivered from lameness, sickness, captivity, or shipwreck? Is not this 'colere imagines,' to worship images, so earnestly forbidden in God's word? If they deny it, let them read the eleventh chapter of Daniel the Prophet, who saith of Antichrist, 'He shall worship God, whom his fathers knew not, with gold, silver, and with precious stones, and other things of pleasure:' in which place the Latin word is *colet*." "To increase this madness, wicked men, which have the keeping of such images, for their great lucre and advantage, after the example of the Gentiles idolaters, have reported and spread abroad, as well by *lying tales* as written fables, divers miracles of images: as that such an image miraculously was sent from heaven, even like the Palladium, or Magna Diana Ephesiorum. Such another was as miraculously found in the earth, as the man's head was in the Capitol, or the horse's head in Capua. Such an image was brought by angels. Such an one came itself far from the East to the West, as Dame Fortune fled to Rome. Such an image of our Lady was painted by St. Luke, whom of a physician they have made a painter for that purpose. Such an one an hundred yokes of oxen could not move, like Bona Dea, whom the ship could not carry; or Jupiter Olympius, which laughed the artificers to scorn, that went about to remove him to Rome. Some images, though they were hard and stony, yet, for tender heart and pity, wept. Some, like Castor and Pollux, helping their friends in battle, sweat, as marble pillars do in dankish weather. Some spake more monstrously than ever did Balaam's ass, who

had life and breath in him. Such a cripple came and saluted this saint of oak, and by and by he was made whole; and, lo! here hangeth his crutch. Such an one in a tempest vowed to St. Christopher, and 'scaped; and behold, here is a ship of wax. Such an one, by St. Leonard's help, brake out of prison, and see where his fetters hang."..... "The Relics we must kiss and offer unto, specially on Relic Sunday. And while we offer, (that we should not be weary, or repent us of our cost,) the music and minstrelsy goeth merrily all the offertory time, with praising and calling upon those saints, whose relics be then in presence. Yea, and the water also, wherein those relics have been dipped, must with great reverence be reserved, as very holy and effectuous."..... "Because Relics were so gainful, few places were there but they had Relics provided for them. And for more plenty of Relics, some one saint had many heads, one in one place, and another in another place. Some had six arms, and twenty-six fingers. And where our LORD bare His cross alohe, if all the pieces of the relics thereof were gathered together, the greatest ship in England would scarcely bear them; and yet the greatest part of it, they say, doth yet remain in the hands of the Infidels; for the which they pray in their beads-bidding, that they may get it also into their hands, for such godly use and purpose. And not only the bones of the saints, but every thing appertaining to them, was a holy relic. In some place they offer a sword, in some the scabbard, in some a shoe, in some a saddle that had been set upon some holy horse, in some the coals wherewith St. Laurence was roasted, in some place the tail of the ass which our LORD JESUS CHRIST sat on, to be kissed and offered unto for a relic. For rather than they would lack a relic, they would offer you a horse bone instead of a virgin's arm, or the tail of the ass to be kissed and offered unto for relics. O wicked, impudent, and most shameless men, the devisers of these things! O silly, foolish, and dastardly daws, and more beastly than the ass whose tail they kissed, that believe such things!"..... "Of these things already rehearsed, it is evident that our image maintainers have not only made images, and set them up in temples, as did the Gentiles idolaters their idols; but also that they have had the same idolatrous opinions of the saints, to whom they have made images, which the Gentiles idolaters had of their false gods; and have not only worshipped their images with the same rites, ceremonies, superstition, and all circumstances, as did the Gentiles idolaters their idols, but in many points have also far exceeded them in all wickedness, foolishness, and madness."—*Homily on Peril of Idolatry*, p. 193—197.

It will be observed that in this extract, as elsewhere in the Homilies, it is implied that the Bishop or the Church of Rome is Antichrist; but this is a statement bearing on prophetic interpretation, not on doctrine; and one besides which cannot be reasonably brought to illustrate or explain any of the positions of the Articles; and therefore it may be suitably passed over.

In another place the Homilies speak as follows :

"Our churches stand full of such great puppets, *wondrously decked and adorned*; garlands and coronets be set on their heads, precious pearls hanging about their necks; their fingers shine with rings, set with precious stones; their dead and stiff bodies are clothed with garments stiff with gold. You would believe that the images of our men-saints were some princes of Persia land with their proud apparel; and the idols of our women-saints were *nice and well-trimmed harlots, tempting their paramours to wantonness*: whereby the saints of God are not honoured, but most dishonoured, and their godliness soberness, chastity, contempt of riches, and of the vanity of the world, defaced and brought in doubt by such *monstrous decking*, most differing from their sober and godly lives. And because the whole pageant must thoroughly be played, it is not enough thus to deck idols, but at last come in the priests themselves, likewise decked with gold and pearl, that they may be meet servants for such lords and ladies, and fit worshippers of such gods and goddesses. And with a solemn pace they pass forth before these *golden puppets*, and *fall down* to the ground on their marrow-bones before these honourable idols; and then rising up again, *offer up odours and incense* unto them, to give the people an example of double idolatry, by worshipping not only the idol, but the gold also, and riches, wherewith it is garnished. Which thing, the most part of our old Martyrs, rather than they would do, or once *kneel*, or *offer up* one crumb of *incense* before an image, suffered most cruel and terrible deaths, as the histories of them at large do declare." "O books and scriptures, in the which the devilish schoolmaster, Satan, hath penned the lewd lessons of wicked idolatry, for his dastardly disciples and scholars to behold, read, and learn, to God's most high dishonour, and their most horrible damnation! Have we not been much bound, think you, to those which should have taught us the truth out of God's Book and his Holy Scripture, that they have shut up that Book and Scripture from us, and none of us so bold as once to open it, or read in it? And instead thereof, to spread us abroad these goodly, carved, and gilded books and painted scriptures, to teach us such good and godly lessons? Have not they done well, after they ceased to stand in pulpits themselves, and to teach the people committed to their instruction, keeping silence of God's word, and become dumb dogs, (as the Prophet calleth them,) to set up in their stead, on every pillar and corner of the church, such goodly doctors, as dumb, but more wicked than themselves be? We need not to complain of the lack of one dumb parson, having so many dumb devilish vicars (I mean these idols and painted puppets) to teach in their stead. Now in the mean season, whilst the dumb and dead idols stand thus *decked and clothed*, contrary to God's law and commandment, the poor Christian people, the lively images of God, commended to us so tenderly by our SAVIOUR CHRIST, as most dear to Him, stand naked, shivering for cold, and their teeth chattering in their heads, and no man covereth them, are pined with hunger and thirst, and no man giveth them a penny to refresh them;

whereas pounds be ready at all times (contrary to God's word and will) to *deck and trim* dead stocks and stones, which neither feel cold, hunger, nor thirst."—*Homily on Peril of Idolatry*, p. 219—222.

Again, with a covert allusion to the abuses of the day, the Homilist says elsewhere, of Scripture,

"There shall you read of Baal, Moloth, Chamos, Melchom, Baalpeor, Astarothe, Bel, the Dragon, Priapus, the brazen Serpent, the twelve Signs, and many others, unto whose images the people, with great devotion, invented *pilgrimages*, *precious decking and censing* them, *kneeling down* and *offering* to them, thinking that an high merit before God, and to be esteemed above the precepts and commandments of God."—*Homily on Good Works*, p. 42.

Again, soon after :

"What man, having any judgment or learning, joined with a true zeal unto God, doth not see and lament to have entered into CHRIST'S religion, such false doctrine, superstition, idolatry, hypocrisy, and other enormities and abuses, so as by little and little, through the sour leaven thereof, the sweet bread of God's holy word hath been much hindered and laid apart? Never had the Jews, in their most blindness, so many *pilgrimages* unto images, nor used so much *kneeling, kissing, and censing* of them, as hath been used in our time. Sects and feigned religions were neither the fortieth part so many among the Jews, nor more superstitiously and ungodly abused, than of late years they have been among us: which sects and religions had so many hypocritical and feigned works in their state of religion, as they arrogantly named it, that their lamps, as they said, ran always over, able to satisfy not only for their own sins, but also for all other their benefactors, brothers, and sisters of religion, as most ungodly and craftily they had persuaded the multitude of ignorant people; keeping in divers places, as it were, marts or markets of merits, being full of their holy relics, images, shrines, and works of overflowing abundance, ready to be sold; and all things which they had were called holy—holy cows, holy girdles, holy pardons, holy beads, holy shoes, holy rules, and all full of holiness. And what thing can be more foolish, more superstitious, or ungodly, than that men, women, and children, should wear a friar's coat to deliver them from agues or pestilence; or when they die, or when they be buried, cause it to be cast upon them, *in hope thereby to be saved*? Which superstition, although (thanks be to GOD) it hath been little used in this realm, yet in divers other realms it hath been, and yet is, used among many, both learned and unlearned."—*Homily on Good Works*, pp. 45, 46.

[Once more :—

"True religion then, and pleasing of God, standeth not in making, setting up, painting, gilding, clothing, and decking of dumb and dead images (which be but great puppets and babies for old fools in dotage, and wicked idolatry, to dally and play with), nor in kissing of them, capping, kneeling, offering to them,

incensing of them, setting up of candles, hanging up of legs, arms, or whole bodies of wax before them, or praying or asking of them, or of saints, things belonging only to God to give. But all these things be vain and abominable, and most damnable before God."—*Homily on Peril of Idolatry*, p. 223.]

Now the veneration and worship condemned in these and other passages are such as these : kneeling before images, lighting candles to them, offering them incense, going on pilgrimage to them, hanging up crutches, &c. before them, lying tales about them, belief in miracles as if wrought by them through illusion of the devil, decking them up immodestly, and providing incentives by them to bad passions ; and, in like manner, merry music and minstrelsy, and licentious practices in honour of relics, counterfeit relics, multiplication of them, absurd pretences about them. This is what the Article means by "the Romish doctrine," which, in agreement to one of the above extracts, it calls "a fond thing," *res futilis* ; for who can ever hope, except the grossest and most blinded minds, to be gaining the favour of the blessed saints, while they come with unchaste thoughts and eyes, that cannot cease from sin ; and to be profited by "pilgrimage-going," in which "Lady Venus and her son Cupid were rather worshipped wantonly in the flesh, than GOD the FATHER, and our SAVIOUR CHRIST HIS SON, truly worshipped in the SPIRIT ?"

Here again it is remarkable that, urged by the truth of the allegation, the Council of Trent is obliged, both to confess the above-mentioned enormities in the veneration of relics and images, and to forbid them :

"Into these holy and salutary observances should any abuses creep, of these the Holy Council strongly [vehementer] desires the utter extinction ; so that no images of a false doctrine, and supplying to the uninstructed opportunity of perilous error, should be set up. . . . All superstition also in invocation of saints, veneration of relics, and sacred use of images, be put away ; all *filthy lares* be cast out of doors ; and all *wantonness* be avoided ; so that *images be not painted or adorned with an immodest beauty* ; or the celebration of Saints and attendance on Relics be abused to *revelries and drunkennesses* ; as though festival days were kept in honour of saints by *luxury and lasciviousness*."—*Sess. 25*.

[On the whole, then, by the Romish doctrine of the veneration and worshipping of images and relics, the article means all maintenance of those idolatrous honours which have been and are paid

them so commonly throughout the church of Rome, with the superstitions, profanities, and impurities consequent thereupon.]

4. Invocation of Saints.

By "invocation" here is not meant the mere circumstance of addressing beings out of sight, because we use the Psalms in our daily service, which are frequent in invocations of Angels to praise and bless God. In the Benedicite too we address "the spirits and souls of the righteous."

Nor is it a "fond" invocation to pray that unseen beings may bless us; for this [Bishop Ken does in his Evening Hymn:—

O may my Guardian, while I sleep,
Close to my bed his vigils keep,
His love angelical fastil,
Stop all the avenues of ill, &c.]¹

On the other hand, judging from the example set us in the Homilies themselves, invocations are not censurable, and certainly not "fond," if we mean nothing definite by them, addressing them to beings which we *know* cannot hear, and using them as interjections. The Homilist seems to avail himself of this proviso in a passage, which will serve to begin our extracts in illustration of the *superstitious* use of invocations.

"We have left Him neither heaven, nor earth, nor water, nor country, nor city, peace nor war to rule and govern, neither men, nor beasts, nor their diseases to cure; that a godly man might justly, for zealous indignation, cry out, *O heaven, O earth, and seas* ², what madness and wickedness against GOD are men fallen into! What dishonour do the creatures to their CREATOR and MAKER! And if we remember GOD sometimes, yet, because we doubt of His ability or will to help, we join to Him another helper, as if He were a noun adjective, using these sayings: such as learn, GOD and St. Nicholas be my speed: such as neese, GOD help and St. John: to the horse, GOD and St. Loy save thee. Thus are we become like horses and mules, which have no understanding. For is there not one GOD only, who by His power and wisdom made all things, and by His providence governeth the same, and by His goodness maintaineth and saveth them? Be not all things of Him, by Him, and through Him? Why dost thou *turn from the CREATOR to the creatures*? This is the manner of the Gentiles idolaters: but thou art a Christian, and therefore by CHRIST alone hast access to GOD the FATHER, and help of Him only."—*Homily on Peril of Idolatry*, p. 189.

¹ [A passage here occurred in 1st edition upon Rev. i. 4.]

² O cœlum, o terra, o maria Neptuni. *Terent. Adelph. v. 3.*

Again, just before—

“Terentius Varro sheweth, that there were three hundred Jupiters in his time: there were no fewer Veneres and Dianæ: we had no fewer Christophers, Ladies, and Mary Magdalens, and other saints. Cœnomus and Hesiodus shew, that in their time there were thirty thousand gods. I think we had no fewer saints, to whom we gave the honour due to GOD. And they have not only spoiled the true living GOD of his due honour in temples, cities, countries, and lands, by such devices and inventions as the Gentiles idolaters have done before them: but the sea and waters have as well special saints with them, as they had gods with the Gentiles, Neptune, Triton, Nereus, Castor and Pollux, Venus, and such other: in whose places become St. Christopher, St. Clement, and divers other, and specially our Lady, to whom shipmen sing, ‘Ave, maris stella.’ Neither hath the fire escaped their idolatrous inventions. For, instead of Vulcan and Vesta, the Gentiles’ gods of the fire, our men have placed St. Agatha, and make litters on her day for to quench fire with. Every artificer and profession hath his special saint, as a peculiar god. As for example, scholars have St. Nicholas and St. Gregory: painters, St. Luke; neither lack soldiers their Mars, nor lovers their Venus, amongst Christians. All diseases have their special saints, as gods the curers of them; the falling-evil St. Cornelio, the tooth-ache St. Apollin, &c. Neither do beasts nor cattle lack their gods with us; for St. Loy is the horse-leech, and St. Anthony the swineherd.’ —*Ibid.*, p. 183.

The same subject is introduced in connexion with a lament over the falling off of attendance on religious worship consequent upon the Reformation:

“God’s vengeance hath been and is daily provoked, because much wicked people pass nothing to resort to the Church, either for that they are so sore blinded, that they understand nothing of God and godliness, and care not with devilish example to offend their neighbours; or else for that they see the Church altogether scoured of such *gay gazing sights*, as their gross fantasy was greatly delighted with, because they see the false religion abandoned, and the true restored, which seemeth an unsavoury thing to their unsavoury taste; as may appear by this, that a woman said to her neighbour, ‘Alas, gossip, what shall we now do at church, since all the saints are taken away, since all the *goodly sights* we were wont to have are gone, since we cannot hear the like *piping, singing, chanting, and playing upon the organs*, that we could before!’ But, dearly beloved, we ought greatly to rejoice, and give GOD thanks, that our churches are delivered of all those things which displeased GOD so sore, and *filthily defiled* his house and his place of prayer, for the which he hath justly destroyed many nations, according to the saying of St. Paul: ‘If any man defile the temple of GOD, GOD will him destroy.’ And this ought we greatly to praise GOD for, that *superstitious and idolatrous* manners as were utterly naught, and defaced GOD’s glory, are utterly abolished, as they most justly deserved: and yet those things that either GOD was honoured with, or his

people edified, are decently retained, and in our churches comely practised.”—
On the Place and Time of Prayer, pp. 293, 294.

Again :

“ There are certain conditions most requisite to be found in every such a one that must be called upon, which if they be not found in Him unto whom we pray, then doth our prayer avail us nothing, but is altogether in vain.

“ The first is this, that He, to whom we make our prayers, be able to help us. The second is, that He will help us. The third is, that He be such a one as may hear our prayers. The fourth is, that He understand better than ourselves what we lack, and how far we have need of help. If these things be to be found in any other, saving only GOD, then may we lawfully call upon some other besides GOD. But what man is so gross, but he well understandeth that these things are only proper to Him who is omnipotent, and knoweth all things, even the very secrets of the heart ; that is to say, only and to GOD alone ? Whereof it followeth that we must call neither upon angel, nor yet upon saint, but only and solely upon GOD, as St. Paul doth write : ‘ How shall men call upon Him, in whom they have not believed ? ’ So that *invocation* or *prayer* may not be made without faith in Him on whom they call ; but that we must first *believe* in Him before we can make our prayer unto Him, whereupon we must only and solely pray unto GOD. For to say that we should *believe* in either angel or saint, or in any other living creature, were *most horrible blasphemy* against GOD and his holy word ; neither ought this fancy to enter into the heart of any Christian man, because we are expressly taught in the word of the LORD only to repose our faith in the blessed TRINITY, in whose only name we are also baptized, according to the express commandment of our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, in the last of St. Matthew.

“ But that the truth hereof may better appear, even to them that be most simple and unlearned, let us consider what prayer is. St. Augustine calleth it a lifting up of the mind to GOD ; that is to say, an humble and lowly pouring out of the heart to GOD. Isidorus saith, that it is an affection of the heart, and not a labour of the lips. So that, by these plans, true prayer doth consist not so much in the outward sound and voice of words, as in the inward groaning and crying of the heart to GOD.

“ Now, then, is there any angel, any virgin, any patriarch, or prophet, among the dead, that can understand or know the meaning of the heart ? The Scripture saith, ‘ it is GOD that searcheth the heart and reins, and that He only knoweth the hearts of the children of men.’ As for the saints, they have so little knowledge of the secrets of the heart, that many of the ancient fathers greatly doubt whether they know any thing at all, that is commonly done on earth. And albeit some think they do, yet St. Augustine, a doctor of great authority, and also antiquity, hath this opinion of them ; that they know no more what we do on earth, than we know what they do in heaven. For proof whereof, he allegeth the words of Isaiah the prophet, where it is said, ‘ Abraham is ignorant of us, and Israel knoweth us not.’ His mind therefore is this,

not that we should put any religion in *worshipping* them, or *praying* unto them; but that we should honour them by following their virtuous and godly life. For, as he witnesseth in another place, the martyrs, and holy men in time past, were wont, after their death, to be *remembered* and *named* of the priest at divine service; but never to be *invoked* or *called upon*. And why so? Because the priest, saith he, is GOD's priest, and not theirs: whereby he is bound to call upon GOD, and not upon them.....O but I dare not (will some man say) trouble GOD at all times with my prayers: we see that in king's houses, and courts of princes, men cannot be admitted, unless they first use the help and means of some special nobleman, to come to the speech of the king, and to obtain the thing that they would have.

"CHRIST, sitting in heaven, hath an everlasting priesthood, and always prayeth to His FATHER for them that be penitent, obtaining, by virtue of His wounds, which are evermore in the sight of GOD, not only perfect remission of our sins, but also all other necessities that we lack in this world; so that this Holy Mediator is sufficient in heaven, and needeth no others to help Him.

"Invocation is a thing *proper unto GOD*, which if we attribute unto the saints, it soundeth unto their reproach, neither can they well bear it at our hands. When Paul healed a certain lame man, which was impotent in his feet, at Lystra, the people would have *done sacrifice* unto him and Barnabas; who, rending their clothes, refused it, and exhorted them to *worship* the true GOD. Likewise in the Revelation, when St. John *fell before the angel's feet to worship him*, the angel would not permit him to do it, but commanded him that he should worship GOD. Which examples declare unto us, that the saints and angels in heaven will not have us to do *any honour* unto them, *that is due and proper unto GOD*."—*Homily on Prayer*, p. 272—277.

Whereas, then, it has already been shown that not *all* invocation is wrong, this last passage plainly tells us *what kind* of invocation is not allowable, or what is meant by invocation in its exceptionable sense: viz. "a thing proper to GOD," as being part of the "honour that is due and proper unto GOD." And two instances are specially given of such calling and invoking, viz., *sacrificing*, and *falling down in worship*. Besides this, the Homilist adds, that it is wrong to pray to them for "necessaries in this world," and to accompany their services with "piping, singing, chanting, and playing" on the organ, and of invoking saints as patrons of particular elements, countries, arts, or remedies.

Here again, as before, the Article gains a witness and concurrence from the Council of Trent. "Though," say the divines there assembled, "the Church has been accustomed sometimes to

celebrate a few masses to the honour and remembrance of saints, yet she *doth not teach that sacrifice is offered to them*, but to God alone, who crowned them; wherefore neither is the priest wont to say, *I offer sacrifice to thee, O Peter, or O Paul*, but to God." (Sess. 22.)

Or, to know what is meant by fond invocations, we may refer to the following passage of Bishop Andrews' answer to Cardinal Perron:—

"This one point is needful to be observed throughout all the Cardinal's answer, that he hath framed to himself five distinctions:—(1.) Prayer *direct*, and prayer *oblique*, or indirect. (2.) Prayer *absolute*, and prayer *relative*. (3.) Prayer *sovereign*, and prayer *subaltern*. (4.) Prayer *final*, and prayer *transitory*. (5.) Prayer *sacrificial*, and prayer *out of, or from the sacrifice*. Prayer *direct, absolute, final, sovereign, sacrificial*, that must not be made to the saints, but to God only: but as for *prayer oblique, relative, transitory, subaltern, from, or out of the sacrifice*, that (saith he) we may make to the saints.

"For all the world, like the question in Scotland, which was made some fifty years since, whether the *Pater noster* might not be said to saints. For then they in like sort devised the distinction of—(1.) *Ultimate, et non ultimate*. (2.) *Principaliter, et minus principaliter*. (3.) *Primarie et secundarie: Capiendo stricte et capiendo large*. And as for *ultimate, principaliter, primarie et capiendo stricte*, they concluded it must go to God: but *non ultimate, minus principaliter, secundarie, et capiendo large*, it might be allowed saints.

"Yet it is sure, that in these distinctions is the whole substance of his answer. And whensoever he is pressed, he flees straight to his *prayer relative and prayer transitory*; as if *prier pour prier*, were all the Church of Rome did hold; and that they made no prayers to the saints, but only to pray for them. The Bishop well remembers, that Master Casaubon more than once told him that reasoning with the Cardinal, touching the invocation of saints, the Cardinal freely confessed to him *that he had never prayed to saint in all his life, save only when he happened to follow the procession*; and that then he sung *Ora pro nobis* with the clerks indeed, *but else not*.

"Which cometh much to this opinion he now seemeth to defend: but wherein *others* of the Church of Rome will surely give him over, so that it is to be feared that the Cardinal will be shent for this, and *some censure come out against him* by the Sorbonne. For the world cannot believe that *oblique relative* prayer is all that is sought; seeing it is most evident, by their breviaries, hours, and rosaries, that they pray *directly, absolutely, and finally to saints*, and make no mention at all of *prier pour prier*, to pray to God to forgive them; but to the saints, to give it themselves. So that all he saith comes to nothing. They say to the blessed Virgin, 'Sancta Maria,' not only 'Ora pro nobis:' but 'Succurre miseria, juva pusillanimes, resolve fiebles, accipe quod offerimus, dona quod rogamus, excusa quod timemus,' &c. &c....

"All which, and many more, shew plainly that the *practices* of the Church of Rome, in this point of invocation of saints is far otherwise than Cardinal Perron would bear the world in hand: and that *prier pour prier*, is not all, but that 'Tu dona cœlum, Tu laxa, Tu sana, Tu solve crimina, Tu duc, conduc, induc, perduc ad gloriam; Tu serva, Tu ser opem, Tu aufer, Tu confer vitam,' are said to them (*totidem verbis*): more than which cannot be said to God himself. And again, 'Hic nos solvat à peccatis, Hic nostros tergat reatus, Hic arma conferat, Hic hostem fuget, Hæc gubernet, Hic aptet tuo conspectui;' which if they be not *direct* and *absolute*, it would be asked of them, what is *absolute* or *direct*?"—*Bishop Andrews's Answer to Chapter XX. of Cardinal Perron's Reply*, p. 57—62.

Bellarmino's admissions quite bear out the principles laid down by Bishop Andrews and the Homilist:—

"It is not lawful," he says, "to ask of the saints to grant to us, as if they were the *authors* of divine benefits, glory or grace, or the other means of blessedness. . . . This is proved, first, from Scripture, 'The LORD will give grace and glory.' (Psal. lxxxiv.) Secondly, from the usage of the Church; for in the mass-prayers, and the saints' offices, we never ask any thing else, but that at their prayers, benefits may be granted to us by God. Thirdly, from reason: for *what we need surpasses the powers of the creature*, and therefore even of saints; therefore we ought to ask nothing of saints beyond their impetrating from God what is profitable for us. Fourthly, from Augustine and Theodoret, who expressly teach that saints are not to be invoked *as gods*, but as able to gain from God what they wish. However, it must be observed, when we say, that nothing should be asked of saints but their prayers for us, the question is not about the words, but the *sense* of the words. For, as far as words go, it is *lawful* to say: 'St. Peter, pity me, save me, open for me the gate of heaven;' also, 'give me health of body, patience, fortitude,' &c., provided that we mean 'save and pity me *by praying for me*;' 'grant me this or that *by thy prayers and merits*.' For so speaks Gregory Nazianzen, and many others of the ancients, &c."—*De Sancti. Beat. i. 17.*

[By the doctrine of the invocation of saints then, the article means all maintenance of addresses to them which entrench upon the incommunicable honour due to God alone, such as have been, and are in the church of Rome, and such as, equally with the peculiar doctrine of purgatory, pardons, and worshipping and adoration of images and relics, as actually taught in that church, are unknown to the Catholic Church.]

§ 7.—*The Sacraments.*

Art. xxv.—“Those five, commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown, partly of the corrupt following (*pravâ imitatione*) of the Apostles, partly from states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of sacraments, (*sacramentorum eandem rationem*,) with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.”

This Article does not deny the five rites in question to be sacraments, but to be sacraments in *the sense* in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are sacraments; “sacraments of *the Gospel*,” sacraments *with an outward sign ordained of God*.

They are not sacraments in *any* sense, *unless* the Church has the power of dispensing grace through rites of its own appointing, or is endued with the gift of blessing and hallowing the “rites or ceremonies” which, according to the twentieth article, it “hath power to decree.” But we may well believe that the Church has this gift.

If, then, a sacrament be merely *an outward sign of an invisible grace given under it*, the five rites may be sacraments; but if it must be an outward sign *ordained by God or CHRIST*, then only Baptism and the Lord's Supper are sacraments.

Our Church acknowledges both definitions;—in the article before us, *the stricter*; and again in the Catechism, where a sacrament is defined to be “an outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace, given unto us, *ordained by CHRIST himself*.” And this, it should be remarked, is a characteristic of our formularies in various places, not to deny the *truth* or *obligation* of certain doctrines or ordinances, but simply to deny, (what no Roman opponent now can successfully maintain,) that CHRIST

for certain directly ordained them. For instance, in regard to the visible Church it is sufficient that the ministration of the sacraments should be "*according to CHRIST's ordinance.*" Art. xix.—And it is added, "in all those things that *of necessity* are requisite to the same." The question entertained is, what is *the least* that God requires of us. Again, "the baptism of young children is to be retained, as most agreeable to *the institution of CHRIST.*" Art. xxvii.—Again, "the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by *CHRIST's ordinance* reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." Art. xxviii.—Who will maintain the paradox that what the Apostles "set in order when they came" had been already done by *CHRIST*? Again, "both parts of the *LORD's sacrament, by CHRIST's ordinance and commandment,* ought to be administered to all Christian men alike." Art. xxx.—Again, "bishops, priests, and deacons, *are not commanded by God's law* either to vow the estate of single life or to abstain from marriage." Art. xxxii.—[In making this distinction, however, it is not here insinuated, though the question is not entered on in these particular articles, that every one of these points, of which it is only said that they are not ordained by *CHRIST*, is justifiable on grounds short of His appointment.]

On the other hand, our Church takes the *wider* sense of the meaning of the word sacrament in the Homilies; observing—

"In the second Book against the Adversary of the Law and the Prophets, he [St. Augustin] calleth sacraments *holy signs*. And writing to Bonifacius of the baptism of infants, he saith, 'If sacraments had not a certain similitude of those things whereof they be sacraments, they should be no sacraments at all. And of this similitude they do for the most parts receive the names of the self-same things they signify.' By these words of St. Augustine it appeareth, that he alloweth the common description of a sacrament, which is, that it is a *visible sign of an invisible grace*; that is to say, that setteth out to the eyes and other outward senses the inward working of God's free mercy, and doth, as it were, seal in our hearts the promises of God."—*Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments*, pp. 296, 297.

Accordingly, starting with this definition of St. Augustine's, the writer is necessarily carried on as follows:—

"You shall hear how many sacraments there be, that were instituted by our SAVIOUR CHRIST, and are to be continued, and received of every Christian in

due time and order, and for such purpose as our SAVIOUR CHRIST willed them to be received. And as for the number of them, if they should be considered according to the *exact* signification of a sacrament, namely, for visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sins, and of our holiness and joining in CHRIST, there be but two; namely, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. For although absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin; yet by the *express* word of the New Testament, it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign (I mean laying on of hands) is not *expressly* commanded in the New Testament to be used in absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the LORD'S Supper are: and therefore absolution is no *such* sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are. And though the ordering of ministers hath this visible sign and promise; yet it lacks the promise of remission of sin, as all other sacraments besides the two above named do. Therefore neither it, nor any *other* sacrament else, be *such* sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are. But in a general acception, the name of a sacrament may be attributed to any thing, whereby an holy thing is signified. In which understanding of the word, the ancient writers have given this name, not only to the other five, commonly of late years taken and used for supplying the number of the seven sacraments; but also to divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil, washing of feet, and such like; not meaning thereby to repute them as sacraments, *in the same signification* that the two forenamed sacraments are. And therefore St. Augustine, weighing the true signification and exact meaning of the word, writing to Januarius, and also in the third Book of Christian Doctrine, affirmeth, that the sacraments of the Christians, as they are most excellent in signification, so are they most few in number, and in both places maketh mention expressly of two, the sacrament of Baptism, and the Supper of the LORD. And although there are retained by order of the Church of England, besides these two, certain other rites and ceremonies, about the institution of ministers in the Church, Matrimony, Confirmation of Children, by examining them of their knowledge in the Articles of the Faith, and joining thereto the prayers of the Church for them, and likewise for the Visitation of the Sick; yet no man ought to take these for sacraments, *in such* signification and meaning as the sacraments of Baptism and the LORD'S Supper are: but either for godly states of life, necessary in Christ's Church, and therefore worthy to be set forth by public action and solemnity, by the ministry of the Church, or else judged to be such ordinances as may make for the instruction, comfort, and edification of CHRIST'S Church." — *Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments*, pp. 298—300.

Another definition of the word sacrament, which equally succeeds in limiting it to the two principal rites of the Christian Church, is also contained in the Catechism, as well as alluded to

in the above passage :—"Two only, as *generally necessary* to salvation, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord." On this subject the following remark has been made :—

"The Roman Catholic considers that there are seven [sacraments]; we do not strictly determine the number. We define the word *generally* to be an 'outward sign of an inward grace,' without saying to how many ordinances this applies. However, what we do determine is, that CHRIST has ordained two special sacraments, as *generally necessary to salvation*. This, then, is the characteristic mark of those two, separating them from all other whatever; and this is nothing else but saying in other words that they are the only *justifying* rites, or instruments of communicating the Atonement, which is the one thing necessary to us. Ordination, for instance, gives *power*, yet without making the soul *acceptable* to God; Confirmation gives *light and strength*, yet is the mere *completion* of Baptism; and Absolution may be viewed as a negative ordinance removing the *barrier* which sin has raised between us and that grace, which by inheritance is ours. But the two sacraments 'of the Gospel,' as they may be emphatically styled, are the instruments of inward *life*, according to our LORD's declaration, that Baptism is a new *birth*, and that in the Eucharist we eat the *living* bread."

§ 8.—*Transubstantiation.*

Article xxviii.—“Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine, in the supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.”

What is here opposed as “Transubstantiation,” is the shocking doctrine that “the body of CHRIST,” as the Article goes on to express it, is *not* “given, taken, and eaten, after an heavenly and spiritual manner, but is carnally pressed with the teeth;” that It is a body or substance of a certain extension and bulk in space, and a certain figure and due disposition of parts, whereas we hold that the only substance such, is the bread which we see.

This is plain from Article xxix., which quotes St. Augustine as speaking of the wicked as “carnally and visibly pressing with their teeth the *sacrament* of the body and blood of CHRIST,” not the real substance, a statement which even the Breviary introduces into the service for Corpus Christi day.

This is plain also from the words of the Homily:—“Saith Cyprian, ‘When we do these things, *we need not whet our teeth*, but with sincere faith we break and divide that holy bread. It is well known that the meat we seek in this supper is spiritual food, the nourishment of the soul, a heavenly refection, *and not earthly*; an invisible meat, *and not a bodily*: a ghostly substance, *and not carnal*.’”

Some extracts may be quoted to the same effect from Bishop Taylor. Speaking of what has been believed in the Church of Rome, he says:—

“Sometimes CHRIST hath appeared in His own shape, and blood and flesh hath been pulled out of the mouths of the communicants: and Plegius, the priest, saw an angel, showing CHRIST to him in form of a child upon the altar, whom first he took in his arms and kissed, but did eat him up presently in his other shape, in the shape of a wafer. ‘Speciosa certè pax nebulonis, ut qui

oris præbuerat basium, dentium inferret exitium,' said Berengarius: 'It was but a Judas' kiss to kiss with the lip, and bite with the teeth.'—*Bp. Taylor*, vol. x., p. 12.

Again :—

"Yet if this and the other miracles pretended, had not been illusions or directly fabulous, it had made very much against the present doctrine of the Roman Church; for they represent the body in such measure, as by their explanations it is not, and it cannot be: they represent it broken, a finger, or a piece of flesh, or bloody, or bleeding, or in the form of an infant; and then, when it is in the species of bread: for if, as they say, CHRIST's body is present no longer than the form of bread remained, how can it be CHRIST's body in the miracle, when the species being gone, it is no longer a sacrament? But the dull inventors of miracles in those ages considered nothing of this; the article itself was then gross and rude, and so were the instruments of probation. I noted this, not only to show at what door so incredible a persuasion entered, but that the zeal of prevailing in it hath so blinded the refiners of it in this age, that they still urge these miracles for proof, when, if they do any thing at all, they reprove the present doctrine."—*Bp. Taylor's Works*, vol. ix. ccccx.

Again: the change which is denied in the Article is accurately specified in another passage of the same author :—

"I will not insist upon the unworthy questions which this carnal doctrine introduces . . . neither will I make scrutiny concerning CHRIST's bones, hair, and nails; nor suppose the Roman priests to be such *καρχαρόδοντες*, and to have such 'saws in their mouths:' these are appendages of their persuasion, but to be abominated by all Christian and modest persons, who use to eat not the bodies but the flesh of beasts, and not to devour, but to worship the body of Christ in the exaltation, and now in union with His divinity."—*On the Real Presence*, 11.

And again :—

"They that *deny the spiritual sense*, and affirm the natural, are to remember that CHRIST reprov'd all senses of these words that were not *spiritual*. And by the way let me observe, that the expressions of some chief men among the Romanists are so rude and crass, that it will be impossible to excuse them from the understanding the words in the sense of the men of Capernaum; for, as they understood CHRIST to mean His 'true flesh natural and proper,' so do they: as they thought CHRIST intended they should *tear Him with their teeth and suck His blood*, for which they were offended; so do these men not only think so, but say so, and are not offended. So said Alanus, 'Assertissime loquimur, corpus Christi vere a nobis contrectari, manducari, circumgestari, *dentibus teri* [*ground by the teeth*], *sensibiliter sacrificari* [*sensibly sacrificed*], non minus

quam ante consecrationem panis,' [not less than the bread before consecration] . . . I thought that the Romanists had been glad to separate their own opinion from the carnal conceit of the men of Capernaum and the offended disciples . . . but I find that Bellarmine owns it, even in them, in their rude circumstances, for he affirms that 'CHRIST corrected them *not for supposing so*, but reproved them *for not believing it to be so*.' And indeed himself says as much: 'The body of CHRIST is *truly and properly manducated or chewed* with the body in the Eucharist;' and to take off the foulness of the expression, by avoiding a worse, he is pleased to speak nonsense: 'A thing may be manducated or chewed, though it be not attrite or broken.' . . . But Bellarmine adds, that if you will not allow him to say so, then he grants it in plain terms, that CHRIST's body is chewed, *is attrite, or broken with the teeth*, and that not tropically, *but properly*. . . How? under the species of bread, and invisibly." —*Ibid.* 3.

Take again the statement of Ussher:—

"Paschasius Radbertus, who was one of the first setters forward of this doctrine in the West, spendeth a large chapter upon this point, wherein he telleth us, that CHRIST in the sacrament did show himself 'oftentimes in a visible shape, either in the form of a lamb, or in the colour of flesh and blood; so that while the host was a breaking or an offering, a lamb in the priest's hands, and blood in the chalice should be seen as it were flowing from the sacrifice, that what lay hid in a mystery might to them that yet doubted be made manifest in a miracle.' . . . The first [tale] was . . . of a Roman matron, who found a piece of the sacramental bread turned into the fashion of a finger, all bloody; which afterwards, upon the prayers of St. Gregory, was converted to its former shape again. The other two were first coined by the Grecian liars. . . . The former of these is not only related there, but also in the legend of Simeon Metaphrastes (which is such another author among the Grecians as Jacobus de Voragine was among the Latins) in the life of Arsenius, . . . how that a little child was seen upon the altar, and an angel cutting him into small pieces with a knife, and receiving his blood into the chalice, as long as the priest was breaking the bread into little parts. The latter is of a certain Jew, receiving the sacrament at St. Basil's hands, converted visibly into true flesh and blood." —*Ussher's Answer to a Jesuit*, pp. 62—64.

Or the following:—

"When St. Odo was celebrating the mass in the presence of certain of the clergy of Canterbury, (who maintained that the bread and wine, after consecration, do remain in their former substance, and are not CHRIST's true body and blood, but of a figure of it:) when he was come to confection, presently the fragments of the body of CHRIST which he held in his hands, began to pour forth blood into the chalice. Whereupon he shed tears of joy; and beckoning to them that wavered in their faith, to come near and see the

wonderful work of GOD; as soon as they beheld it they cried out, 'O holy Prelate! to whom the SON of GOD has been pleased to reveal Himself visibly in the flesh, pray for us, that the blood we see here present to our eyes, may again be changed, lest for our unbelief the Divine vengeance fall upon us.' He prayed accordingly; after which, looking in the chalice, he saw the species of bread and wine, where he had left blood. . . .

"St. Wittekundus, in the administration of the Eucharist, saw a child enter into every one's mouth, playing and smiling when some received him, and with an abhorring countenance when he went into the mouths of others; CHRIST thus showing this saint in His countenance, who were worthy, and who unworthy receivers."—*Johnson's Miracles of Saints*, pp. 27, 28.

The same doctrine was imposed by Nicholas the Second on Berengarius, as the confession of the latter shows, which runs thus:—

"I, Berengarius . . . anathematize every heresy, and more particularly that of which I have hitherto been accused . . . I agree with the Roman Church . . . that the bread and wine which are placed on the altar are, after consecration, not only a sacrament, but even the true body and blood of our LORD JESUS CHRIST; and that these are *sensibly*, and not merely sacramentally, but in truth, *handled and broken* by the hands of the priest, and *ground by the teeth* of the faithful."—*Bowden's Life of Gregory VII.*, vol. ii. p. 243.

Another illustration of the sort of doctrine offered in the Article, may be given from Bellarmine, whose controversial statements have already been introduced in the course of the above extracts. He thus opposes the doctrine of *introsusception*, which the spiritual view of the Real Presence naturally suggests:—

He observes, that there are "two particular opinions, false and erroneous, excogitated in the schools: that of Durandus, who thought it probable that the substance of the body of CHRIST in the Eucharist was *without magnitude*; and that of certain ancients, which Occam seems afterwards to have followed, that though it has magnitude, (which they think not really separable from substance,) yet every part is so penetrated by every other, that the body of CHRIST is *without figure*, without distinction and order of parts." With this he contrasts the doctrine which, he maintains, is that of the Church of Rome as well as the general doctrine of the schools, that "in the Eucharist whole CHRIST exists *with magnitude and all accidents*, except that relation to a heavenly location which He has as He is in heaven, and those things which are concomitants

on His existence in that location; and that the parts and members of CHRIST's body do *not* penetrate each other, but are so distinct and arranged one with another, as to have a *figure and order* suitable to a human body."—*De Euchar.* iii. 5.

We see then, that, by transubstantiation, our Article does not confine itself to any abstract theory, nor aim at any definition of the word substance, nor in rejecting it, rejects a word, nor in denying a "*mutatio panis et vini*," is denying *every kind* of change, but opposes itself to a certain plain and unambiguous statement, not of this or that council, but one generally received or taught both in the schools and in the multitude, that the material elements are changed into an earthly, fleshly, and organized body, extended in size, distinct in its parts, which is there where the outward appearances of bread and wine are, and only does not meet the senses, nor even that always.

Objections against "substance," "nature," "change," "accidents," and the like, seem more or less questions of words, and inadequate expressions of the great offence which we find in the received Roman view of this sacred doctrine.

In this connexion it may be suitable to proceed to notice the Explanation appended to the Communion Service, of our kneeling at the Lord's Supper, which requires explanation itself, more perhaps than any part of our formularies. It runs as follows:—

"Whereas it is ordained in this office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants should receive the same kneeling: (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of CHRIST therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the holy communion, as might otherwise ensue;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved,—It is hereby declared, that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of CHRIST's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental blood and wine re-

main still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians; and the natural body and blood of our SAVIOUR CHRIST are in heaven, and not here, it being against the truth of CHRIST's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

Now it may be admitted without difficulty,—1. That "no adoration ought to be done unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received." 2. Nor "unto any *corporal* (i. e. carnal) presence of CHRIST's natural flesh and blood." 3. That "the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances." 4. That to adore them "were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;" and 5. That "the natural body and blood of our SAVIOUR CHRIST are in heaven."

But "to heaven" is added, "*and not here.*" Now, though it be allowed that there is no "*corporal* presence" [i. e. carnal] of "CHRIST's natural flesh and blood" here, it is a further point to allow that "CHRIST's natural body and blood" are "*not here.*" And the question is, how can there be any *presence* at all of His body and blood, yet a presence such, as not to be *here*? How can there be any *presence*, yet not *local*?

Yet that this is the meaning of the paragraph in question is plain, from what it goes on to say in proof of its position: "It being against the truth of CHRIST's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." It is here asserted then, 1. Generally, "no natural body can be in more places than one;" therefore, 2. CHRIST's natural body cannot be in the bread and wine, or there where the bread and wine are seen. In other words, there is no local presence in the Sacrament. Yet, that there is a presence is asserted in the Homilies, as quoted above, and the question is, as just now stated, "How can there be a presence, yet not a local one?"

Now, first, let it be observed that the question to be solved is the truth of a certain philosophical deduction, not of a certain doctrine of Scripture. That there is a real presence, Scripture asserts, and the Homilies, Catechism, and Communion Service confess; but the explanation before us adds, that it is philoso-

phically impossible that it should be a particular kind of presence, a presence of which one can say "it is here," or which is "local." It states then a philosophical deduction; but to such deduction none of us have subscribed. We have professed in the words of the Canon: "That the Book of Prayer, &c. containeth in it *nothing contrary to the word of God.*" Now, a position like this may not be, and is not, "contrary to the word of God," and yet need not be true; *e. g.* we may accept St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, as containing nothing contrary to Scripture, nay, as altogether most scriptural, and yet this would not hinder us from rejecting the account of the Phoenix—as contrary, not to God's word, but to matter of fact. Even the infallibility of the Roman see is not considered to extend to matters of fact or points of philosophy. Nay, we commonly do not consider that we need take the words of Scripture itself literally about the sun's standing still, or the earth being fixed, or the firmament being above. Those at least who distinguish between what is theological in Scripture and what is scientific, and yet admit that Scripture is true, have no ground for wondering at such persons as subscribe to a paragraph, of which at the same time they disallow the philosophy; especially considering they expressly subscribe it only as not "contrary to the word of God." This then is what must be said first of all.

Next, the philosophical position is itself capable of a very specious defence. The truth is, we do not at all know what is meant by distance or intervals absolutely, any more than we know what is meant by absolute time. Late discoveries in geology have tended to make it probable that time may under circumstances go indefinitely faster or slower than it does at present; or in other words, that indefinitely more may be accomplished in a given portion of it. What Moses calls a day, geologists wish to prove to be thousands of years, if we measure time by the operations at present effected in it. It is equally difficult to determine what we mean by distance, or why we should not be at this moment close to the throne of God, though we seem far from it. Our measure of distance is our hand or our foot; but as an object a foot off is not called distant, though the interval is indefinitely

divisible; neither need it be distant either, after it has been multiplied indefinitely. Why should any conventional measure of ours—why should the perception of our eyes or our ears, be the standard of presence or distance? CHRIST may really be close to us, though in heaven, and His presence in the Sacrament may but be a manifestation to the worshipper of that nearness, not a change of place, which may be unnecessary. But on this subject some extracts may be suitably made from a pamphlet published several years since, and admitting of one or two verbal corrections, which, as in the case of other similar quotations above, shall here be made without scruple :—

“In the note at the end of the Communion Service, it is argued, that a body cannot be in two places at once; and that therefore the Body of CHRIST is not *locally* present, in the sense in which we speak of the bread as being locally present. On the other hand, in the Communion Service itself, Catechism, Articles, and Homilies, it is plainly declared, that the Body of CHRIST is in a mysterious way, if not *locally*, yet *really* present, so that we are able after some ineffable manner to receive It. Whereas, then, the objection stands, ‘CHRIST is not really here, because He is not locally here,’ our formularies answer, ‘He is really here, yet not locally.’

“But it may be asked, What is the meaning of saying that CHRIST is really present, yet not locally? I will make a suggestion on the subject. What do we mean by being *present*? How do we define and measure it? To a blind and deaf man, that only is present which he touches: give him hearing, and the range of things present enlarges; every thing is present to him which he hears. Give him at length sight, and the sun may be said to be present to him in the day time, and myriads of stars by night. The *presence*, then, of a thing is a relative word, depending, in a popular sense of it, upon the channels of communication between it and him to whom it is present; and thus it is a word of degree.

“Such is the meaning of *presence*, when used of material objects;—very different from this is the conception we form of the presence of spirit with spirit. The most intimate presence

we can fancy is a spiritual presence in the soul ; it is nearer to us than any material object can possibly be ; for our body, which is the organ of conveying to us the presence of matter, sets bounds to its approach towards us. If, then, spiritual beings can be brought near to us, (and that they can, we know, from what is told us of the influences of Divine grace, and again of evil angels upon our souls) their presence is something *sui generis*, of a more perfect and simple character than any presence we commonly call local. And further, their presence has nothing to do with the degrees of nearness ; they are either present or not present, or, in other words, their coming is not measured by space, nor their absence ascertained by distance. In the case of things material, a transit through space is the necessary condition of approach and presence ; but in things spiritual, (whatever be the condition,) such a transit seems not to be a condition. The condition is unknown. Once more : while beings simply spiritual seem not to exist in place, the Incarnate Son does ; according to our Church's statement already alluded to, that ' the natural body and blood of our SAVIOUR CHRIST are in heaven and not here, it being against the *truth* of CHRIST's natural body to be at one time in *more places than one*.'

" Such seems to be the mystery attending our LORD and SAVIOUR ; He has a *body*, and that *spiritual*. He is in place ; and yet, as being a Spirit, His mode of approach—the mode in which He makes Himself present here or there—may be, for what we know, as different from the mode in which material bodies approach and come, as a spiritual presence is more perfect. As material bodies approach by moving from place to place, so the approach and presence of a spiritual body may be in some other way,—probably is in some other way, since in some other way, (as it would appear) not gradual, progressive, approximating, that is, locomotive, but at once, spirits become present,—may be such as to be consistent with His remaining on God's right hand while He becomes present here,—that is, it may be real yet not local, or, in a word, is *mysterious*. The Body and Blood of CHRIST may be really, literally present in the holy Eucharist, yet not having become present by local passage, may still literally and really be

on God's right hand; so that, though they be present in deed and truth, it may be impossible, it may be untrue to say, that they are literally *in* the elements, or *about* them, or *in* the soul of the receiver. These may be useful modes of speech according to the occasion; but the true determination of all such questions may be this, that CHRIST's Body and Blood are *locally* at God's right hand, yet really *present* here,—present here, but not here in place,—because they are spirit.

“To assist our conceptions on this subject, I would recur to what I said just now about the presence of material objects, by way of putting my meaning in a different point of view. The presence of a material object, in the popular sense of the word, is a matter of degree, and ascertained by the means of apprehending it which belong to him to whom it is present. It is in some sense a correlative of the senses. A fly may be as near an edifice as a man; yet we do not call it present to the fly, because it cannot see it; and we call it present to the man because he can. This, however, is but a popular view of the matter: when we consider it carefully, it certainly is difficult to say what is meant by the presence of a material object relatively to us. It is in some respects truer to say that a thing is present, which is so circumstanced as to act upon us and influence us, whether we are sensible of it or not. Now this is what the Catholic Church seems to hold concerning our LORD's Presence in the Sacrament, that He then personally and bodily is with us in the way an object is which we call present: how He is so, we know not, but that He should be so, though He be millions of miles away, is not more inconceivable than the influence of eyesight upon us is to a blind man. The stars are millions of miles off, yet they impress ideas upon our souls through our sight. We know but of five senses: we know not whether or not human nature be capable of more; we know not whether or not the soul possesses anything analogous to them. We know nothing to negative the notion that the soul may be capable of having CHRIST present to it by the stimulating of dormant, or the development of possible energies.

“As sight for certain purposes annihilates space, so other un-

known capacities, bodily or spiritual, may annihilate it for other purposes. Such a practical annihilation was involved in the appearance of CHRIST to St. Paul on his conversion. Such a practical annihilation is involved in the doctrine of CHRIST's ascension; to speak according to the ideas of space and time commonly received, what must have been the rapidity of that motion by which, within ten days, He placed our human nature at the right hand of God? Is it more mysterious that He should 'open the heavens,' to use the Scripture phrase, in the sacramental rite; that He should then dispense with time and space, in the sense in which they are daily dispensed with, in the sun's warming us at the distance of 100,000,000 of miles, than that He should have dispensed with them on occasion of His ascending on high? He who showed what the passage of an incorruptible body was ere it had reached God's throne, thereby suggests to us what may be its coming back and presence with us now, when at length glorified and become spirit.

"In answer, then, to the problem, *how* CHRIST comes to us while remaining on high, I answer just as much as this,—that He comes by the agency of the HOLY GHOST, *in* and *by the Sacrament*. Locomotion is the means of a material presence; the Sacrament is the means of His spiritual Presence. As faith is the means of our receiving It, so the HOLY GHOST is the Agent and the Sacrament the means of His imparting It; and therefore we call It a Sacramental Presence. We kneel before His heavenly Throne, and the distance is as nothing; it is as if that Throne were the Altar close to us.

"Let it be carefully observed, that I am not proving or determining anything; I am only showing how it is that certain propositions which at first sight seem contradictions in terms, are not so,—I am but pointing out *one* way of reconciling them. If there is but one way assignable, the force of all antecedent objection against the possibility of any at all is removed, and then of course there may be other ways supposable though not assignable. It seems at first sight a mere idle use of words to say that CHRIST is really and literally, yet not locally, present in the Sa-

crament ; that He is there given to us, not in figure but in truth, and yet is still only on the right hand of God. I have wished to remove this seeming impossibility.

“ If it be asked, *why* attempt to remove it, I answer that I have no wish to do so, if persons will not urge it against the Catholic doctrine. Men maintain it as an impossibility, a contradiction in terms, and force a believer in it to say why it should not be so accounted. And then when he gives a reason, they turn round and accuse him of subtleties, and refinements, and scholastic trifling. Let them but believe and act on the truth that the consecrated bread is CHRIST's Body, as He says, and no officious comment on His words will be attempted by any well-judging mind. But when they say ‘this *cannot* be literally true, *because* it is impossible ;’ then they force those who think it is literally true, to explain how, according to their notions, it is not impossible. And those who ask hard questions must put up with hard answers.”

There is nothing, then, in the Explanatory Paragraph which has given rise to these remarks, to interfere with the doctrine, elsewhere taught in our formularies, of a real super-local presence in the Holy Sacrament.

§ 9.—*Masses.*

Article xxxi.—“The sacrifice (*sacrificia*) of *Masses*, in which it was commonly said, that the priests did offer CHRIST for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits (*perniciosæ imposturæ*).”

Nothing can show more clearly than this passage that the Articles are not written against the creed of the Roman Church, but against actual existing errors in it, whether taken into its system or not. Here the sacrifice of the *Mass* is not spoken of, in which the special question of doctrine would be introduced; but “the sacrifice of *Masses*,” certain observances, for the most part private and solitary, which the writers of the Articles knew to have been in force in time past, and saw before their eyes, and which involved certain opinions and a certain teaching. Accordingly the passage proceeds, “in which it *was commonly said*,” which surely is a strictly historical mode of speaking.

If any testimony is necessary in aid of what is so plain from the wording of the Article itself, it is found in the drift of the following passage from Burnet:—

“It were easy from all the rituals of the ancients to shew, that they had none of those ideas that are now in the Roman Church. They had but one altar in a Church, and probably but one in a city: they had but one communion in a day at that altar: so far were they from the many altars in every church, and *the many masses* at every altar, that are now in the Roman Church. They did not know what *solitary masses* were, without a communion. All the liturgies and all the writings of ancients are as express in this matter as is possible. The whole constitution of their worship and discipline shews it. Their worship always concluded with the Eucharist: such as were not capable of it, as the catechumens, and those who were doing public penance for their sins, assisted at the more general parts of the worship; and so much of it was called their mass, because they were dismissed at the conclusion of it. When that was done, then the faithful stayed, and did partake of the Eucharist; and at the conclusion of it they were likewise dismissed, from whence it came to be called the mass of the faithful.—*Burnet on the XXXIst Article*, p. 482.

These sacrifices are said to be “blasphemous fables and pernicious impostures.” Now the “blasphemous fable” is the teach-

ing that there is a sacrifice for sin other than CHRIST's death, and that masses are that sacrifice. And the "pernicious imposture" is the turning this belief into a means of filthy lucre.

1. That the "blasphemous fable" is the teaching that masses are sacrifices for sin distinct from the sacrifice of CHRIST's death, is plain from the first sentence of the Article. "The offering of CHRIST *once made*, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for *all* the sins of the *whole world, both original and actual*. And *there is none other* satisfaction for sin, but *that alone*. Wherefore the sacrifice of masses, &c." It is observable too that the heading of the Article runs, "Of the one oblation of CHRIST finished upon the Cross," which interprets the *drift* of the statement contained in it about masses.

Our Communion Service shows it also, in which the prayer of consecration commences pointedly with a declaration, which has the force of a protest, that CHRIST made on the cross "by His *one* oblation of Himself *once* offered, a *full, perfect, and sufficient* sacrifice, oblation, and *satisfaction* for the sins of the whole world."

And again in the offering of the sacrifice: "We entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that *by the merits and death of Thy SON JESUS CHRIST*, and through faith in his blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain *remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion*."

[And in the notice of the celebration: "I purpose, through God's assistance, to administer to all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed, the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST; to be by them received in remembrance of His meritorious Cross and Passion; *whereby alone* we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven."]

But the popular charge still urged against the Roman system as introducing in the Mass a second or rather continually recurring atonement, is a sufficient illustration, without further quotations, of this part of the Article.

2. That the "blasphemous and pernicious imposture" is the

turning the Mass into a gain is plain from such passages as the following :—

“ With what earnestness, with what vehement zeal, did our SAVIOUR CHRIST drive the buyers and sellers out of the temple of GOD, and hurled down the tables of the changers of money, and the seats of the dove-sellers, and could not abide that a man should carry a vessel through the temple. He told them, that they had made His FATHER’S house a den of thieves, partly through their superstition, hypocrisy, false worship, false doctrine, and insatiable covetousness, and partly through contempt, abusing that place with walking and talking, with worldly matters, without all fear of GOD, and due reverence to that place. What dens of thieves the Churches of England have been made by the blasphemous buying and selling the most precious body and blood of CHRIST in the Mass, as the world was made to believe, at dirges, at months minds, at trentalls, in abbeys and chantries, besides other horrible abuses, (GOD’S holy name be blessed for ever,) which we now see and understand. All these abominations they that supply the room of CHRIST have cleansed and purged the Churches of England of, taking away all such fulsomeness and filthiness, as through blind devotion and ignorance hath crept into the Church these many hundred years.”—*On repairing and keeping clean of Churches*, pp. 229, 230.

Other passages are as follow :—

“ Have not the Christians of late days, and even in our days also, in like manner provoked the displeasure and indignation of ALMIGHTY GOD; partly because they have profaned and defiled their Churches with heathenish and Jewish abuses, with images and idols, with numbers of altars, too superstitiously and intolerably abused, with gross abusing and filthy corrupting of the LORD’S holy Supper, the blessed sacrament of His body and blood, with an infinite number of toys and trifles of their own devices, to make a goodly outward shew, and to deface the homely, simple, and sincere religion of CHRIST JESUS; partly, they resort to the Church like hypocrites, full of all iniquity and sinful life, having a vain and dangerous fancy and persuasion, that if they come to the Church, besprinkle them with holy water, *hear a mass, and be blessed with a chalice*, though they understand not one word of the whole service, nor feel one motion of repentance in their heart, all is well, all is sure?”—*On the Place and Time of Prayer*, p. 293.

Again :—

“ What hath been the cause of this gross idolatry, but the ignorance hereof? What hath been the cause of this *mummish massing*, but the ignorance hereof? Yea, what hath been, and what is at this day the cause of this want of love and charity, but the ignorance hereof? Let us therefore so travel to understand the LORD’S Supper, that we be no cause of the decay of GOD’S worship, of no idolatry, of no *dumb massing*, of no hate and malice; so may we the boldier have access thither to our comfort.”—*Homily concerning the Sacrament*, pp. 377, 378.

To the same purpose is the following passage from Bishop Bull's Sermons :—

"It were easy to shew, how the whole frame of religion and doctrine of the Church of Rome, as it is distinguished from that Christianity which we hold in common with them, is evidently designed and contrived *to serve the interest and profit* of them that rule that Church, by the disservices, yea, and ruin of those souls that are under their government. . . . What can the doctrine of men's playing an aftergame for their salvation in purgatory be designed for, but to enhance *the price of the priest's masses* and dirges for the dead? Why must a *solitary mass, bought for a piece of money*, performed and participated by a priest alone, in a private corner of a church, be, not only against the sense of Scripture and the Primitive Church, but also against common sense and grammar, called a Communion, and be accounted useful to him that buys it, though he never himself receive the sacrament, or but once a year; but for this reason, that there is *great gain*, but no godliness at all, in this doctrine!" —*Bp. Bull's Sermons*, p. 10.

And Burnet says,

"Without going far in tragical expressions, we cannot hold saying what our SAVIOUR said upon another occasion, 'My house is a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves.' A trade was set up on this foundation. The world was made believe, that by the virtue of so many *masses, which were to be purchased by great endowments*, souls were redeemed out of purgatory, and scenes of visions and apparitions, sometimes of the tormented, and sometimes of the delivered souls, were published in all places: which had so wonderful an effect, that in two or three centuries, *endowments* increased to so vast a degree, that if the scandals of the clergy on the one hand, and the statutes of mortmain on the other, had not restrained the profuseness that the world was wrought up to on this account, it is not easy to imagine how far this might have gone; perhaps to an entire subjecting of the temporality to the spirituality. The practices by which this was managed, and the effects that followed on it, we can call by no other name than downright *impostures*; worse than the making or vending false coin: when the world was drawn in by such arts to plain bargains, to *redeem* their own souls, and the souls of their ancestors and posterity, *so many masses were to be said*, and forfeitures were to follow upon their not being said: thus the *masses were really the price* of the lands.—*On Article XXII.*, pp. 303, 304.

The truth of these representations cannot be better shewn than by extracting the following passage from the Session 22 of the Council of Trent :—

"Whereas many things appear to have crept in heretofore, whether by the fault of the times or by the neglect and wickedness of men, foreign to the

dignity of so great a sacrifice, in order that it may regain its due honour and observance, to the glory of God and the edification of His faithful people, the Holy Council decrees, that the bishops, ordinaries of each place, diligently take care and be bound, to forbid and put an end to all those things, which either *avarice*, which is idolatry, or *irreverence*, which is scarcely separable from impiety, or *superstition*, the pretence of true piety, has introduced. And, to say much in a few words, first of all, as to avarice, let them altogether forbid agreements, and bargains of *payment* of whatever kind, and *whatever is given for celebrating new masses*; moreover importunate and mean extortion, rather than petition of alms, and such like practices, which border on simoniacal sin, certainly on *filthy lucre*. . . . And let them banish from the church those musical practices, *when with the organ or with the chant any thing lascivious or impure is mingled*; also all secular practices, vain and therefore profane conversations, promenadings, bustle, clamour; so that the house of God may truly seem and be called the house of prayer. Lastly, lest any opening be given to superstition, let them provide by edict and punishments appointed, that the priests celebrate it at no other than the due hours, nor use rites or ceremonies and prayers in the celebration of masses, other than those which have been approved by the Church, and received on frequent and laudable use. And let them altogether remove from the Church a *set number of certain masses and candles*, which has proceeded rather from *superstitious observance* than from true religion, and teach the people in what consists, and from whom, above all, proceeds the so precious and heavenly fruit of this most holy sacrifice. And let them admonish the same people to come frequently to their parish Churches, at least on Sundays and the greater feasts," &c.

On the whole, then, it is conceived that the Article before us neither speaks against the Mass in itself, nor against its being [an offering, though commemorative,]¹ for the quick and the dead for the remission of sin; [(especially since the decree of Trent says, that "the fruits of the Bloody Oblation are through this most abundantly obtained; so far is the latter from detracting in any way from the former;")] but against its being viewed, on the one hand, as independent of or distinct from the Sacrifice on the Cross, which is blasphemy, and, on the other, its being directed to the emolument of those to whom it pertains to celebrate it, which is imposture in addition.

¹ "An offering for the quick, &c."—*First Edition*.

§ 10.—*Marriage of Clergy.*

Article xxxii.—“Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage.”

There is literally no subject for controversy in these words, since even the most determined advocates of the celibacy of the clergy admit their truth. [As far as clerical celibacy is a duty, it] is grounded not on God's law, but on the Church's rule, or on vow. No one, for instance, can question the vehement zeal of St. Jerome in behalf of this observance, yet he makes the following admission in his attack upon Jovinian :—

“Jovinian says, ‘You speak in vain, since the Apostle appointed Bishops, and Presbyters, and Deacons, the husbands of one wife, and having children.’ But, as the Apostle says, that he has not a precept concerning virgins, yet gives a counsel, as having received mercy of the Lord, and urges throughout that discourse a preference of virginity to marriage, and *advises what he does not command*, lest he seem to cast a snare, and to impose a burden too great for man's nature; *so also*, in ecclesiastical order, seeing that an infant Church was then forming out of the Gentiles, he gives the lighter precepts to recent converts, lest they should fail under them through fear.”—*Adv. Jovinian*, i. 34.

And the Council of Trent merely lays down :

“If any shall say that clerks in holy orders, or regulars, who have solemnly professed chastity, can contract matrimony, and that the contract is valid *in spite of ecclesiastical law or vow*, let him be anathema.”—*Sess. 24 Can. 9.*

Here the observance is placed simply upon rule of the Church or upon vow, neither of which exists in the English Church; “*therefore*,” as the Article logically proceeds, “it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry *at their own discretion*, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.” Our Church leaves the discretion with the clergy; and most persons will allow that, *under our circumstances*, she acts wisely in doing so. That she has *power*, did she so choose, to take from them this discretion, and to oblige them either to marriage [(as is said to be the case as regards the parish priests of the Greek Church)] or to celibacy, would seem to be involved in the doctrine of the following extract from the Homilies; though, whether an en-

forcement either of the one or the other rule would be expedient and pious, is another matter. Speaking of fasting, the Homily says :—

“ God’s Church ought not, neither may it be so tied to that or any other order now made, or hereafter to be made and devised by the authority of man, but that *it may lawfully, for just causes, alter, change, or mitigate* those ecclesiastical decrees and orders, yea, *recede wholly from them, and break them*, when they tend either to superstition or to impiety; when they draw the people from God rather than work any edification in them. This authority CHRIST Himself used, and *left it to His Church*. He used it, I say, for the order or decree made by the elders for washing oftentimes, which was diligently observed of the Jews; yet tending to superstition, our SAVIOUR CHRIST altered and changed the same in His Church into a profitable sacrament, the sacrament of our regeneration, or new birth. This authority to mitigate laws and decrees ecclesiastical, the Apostles practised, when they, writing from Jerusalem unto the congregation that was at Antioch, signified unto them, that they would not lay any further burden upon them, but these necessities: that is, ‘that they should abstain from things offered unto idols, from blood, from that which is strangled, and from fornication;’ notwithstanding that Moses’s law required many other observances. This authority to change the orders, decrees, and constitutions of the Church, was, after the Apostles’ time, used of the fathers about the manner of fasting, as it appeareth in the Tripartite History. Thus ye have heard, good people, first, that Christian subjects are bound even in conscience to obey princes’ laws, which are not repugnant to the laws of God. Ye have also heard that CHRIST’s Church is not so bound to observe any order, law, or decree made by man, to prescribe a form in religion, but that the Church hath full power and authority from God to change and alter the same, when need shall require; which hath been shewed you by the example of our SAVIOUR CHRIST, by the practice of the Apostles, and of the Fathers since that time.”—*Homily on Fasting*, p. 242—244.

To the same effect the 34th Article declares, that,

“ It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and *may be changed* according to diversities of countries, times, and men’s manners, so that nothing be ordained against God’s Word. Whosoever, *through his private judgment*, willingly and purposely doth openly *break* the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of GOD, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly.”—*Article XXXIV*.

§ 11.—*The Homilies.*

Art. xxxv.—“The second Book of Homilies doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies.”

This Article has been treated of in No. 82 of these Tracts, in the course of an answer given to an opponent, who accused its author of not fairly receiving the Homilies, because he dissented from their doctrine, that the Bishop of Rome is Antichrist, and that regeneration was vouchsafed under the law. The passage of the Tract shall here be inserted, with some abridgment.

“I say plainly, then, I have not *subscribed* the Homilies, nor was it ever intended that any member of the English Church should be subjected to what, if considered as an extended confession, would indeed be a yoke of bondage. Romanism surely is innocent, compared with that system which should impose upon the conscience a thick octavo volume, written flowingly and freely by fallible men, to be received exactly, sentence by sentence : I cannot conceive any grosser instance of a pharisaical tradition than this would be. No : such a proceeding would render it impossible (I will say) for any one member, lay or clerical, of the Church to remain in it, who was subjected to such an ordeal. For instance ; I do not suppose that any reader would be satisfied with the political reasons for fasting, though indirectly introduced, yet fully admitted and dwelt upon in the Homily on that subject. He would not like to subscribe the declaration that eating fish was a duty, not only as being a kind of fasting, but as making provisions cheap, and encouraging the fisheries. He would not like the association of religion with earthly politics.

“How, then, are we bound to the Homilies ? By the Thirty-fifth Article, which speaks as follows :—‘The second Book of

Homilies . . . doth contain a godly and wholesome *doctrine*, and necessary for these times, as doth the former *Book of Homilies*.' Now, observe, this Article does not speak of every statement made in them, but of the '*doctrine*.' It speaks of the *view or cast, or body of doctrine* contained in them. In spite of ten thousand incidental propositions, as in any large book, there is, it is obvious, a certain line of doctrine, which may be contemplated continuously in its shape and direction. For instance; if you say you disapprove the doctrine contained in the Tracts for the Times, no one supposes you to mean that every sentence and half sentence is a lie. I say then, that, in like manner, when the Article speaks of the *doctrine* of the Homilies, it does not measure the letter of them by the inch, it does not imply that they contain no propositions which admit of two opinions; but it speaks of a certain determinate line of doctrine, and moreover adds, it is '*necessary for these times*.' Does not *this*, too, show the same thing? If a man said, the Tracts for the Times are *seasonable* at this moment, as their title signifies, would he not speak of them as taking a certain line, and bearing in a certain way? Would he not be speaking, not of phrases or sentences, but of a '*doctrine*' in them tending one way, viewed as a whole? Would he be inconsistent, if after praising them as *seasonable*, he continued, 'yet I do not pledge myself to every view or sentiment; there are some things in them hard of digestion, or overstated, or doubtful, or subtle?'

"If any thing could add to the irrelevancy of the charge in question, it is the particular point in which it is urged that I dissent from the Homilies,—a question concerning the fulfilment of prophecy; viz., whether Papal Rome is Antichrist! An iron yoke indeed you would forge for the conscience, when you oblige us to assent, not only to all matters of *doctrine* which the Homilies contain, but even to their opinion concerning the fulfilment of prophecy. Why, *we* do not ascribe authority in such matters even to the unanimous consent of all the fathers.

"I will put what I have been saying in a second point of view. The Homilies are subsidiary to the Articles; therefore they are of authority so far as they *bring out* the sense of the

Articles, and are not of authority where they do not. For instance, they say that David, though unbaptized, was regenerated, as you have quoted. This statement cannot be of authority, because it not only does not agree, but it even disagrees, with the ninth Article, which translates the Latin word '*renatis*' by the English '*baptized*.' But, observe, if this mode of viewing the Homilies be taken, as it fairly may, *you* suffer from it; for the Apocrypha, *being the subject of an Article*, the comment furnished in the Homily is binding on you, whereas you reject it.

"A further remark will bring us to the same point. Another test of acquiescence in the doctrine of the Homilies is this:—Take their table of contents; examine the headings; these surely, taken together, will give the substance of their teaching. Now I hold fully and heartily the doctrine of the Homilies, under every one of these headings: the only points to which I should not accede, nor think myself called upon to accede, would be certain matters, subordinate to the doctrines to which the headings refer—matters not of doctrine, but of opinion, as, that Rome is the Antichrist; or of historical fact, as, that there was a Pope Joan. But now, on the other hand, can *you* subscribe the doctrine of the Homilies under every one of its formal headings? I believe you *cannot*. The Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion is, in many of its elementary principles, decidedly uncongenial with your sentiments."

This illustration of the subject may be thought enough; yet it may be allowable to add from the Homilies a number of propositions and statements of more or less importance, which are too much forgotten at this day, and are decidedly opposed to the views of certain schools of religion, which at the present moment are so eager in claiming the Homilies to themselves. This is not done, as the extract already read will show, with the intention of maintaining that they are one and all binding on the conscience of those who subscribe the Thirty-fifth Article; but since the strong language of the Homilies against the Bishop of Rome is often quoted, as if it were thus proved to be the doctrine of our Church, it may be as well to show that, following the same

rule, we shall be also introducing Catholic doctrines, which indeed it far more belongs to a Church to profess than a certain view of prophecy, but which do not approve themselves to those who hold it. For instance, we read as follows:—

1. "The great clerk and godly preacher, St. John Chrysostom."—1 B. i. 1. And, in like manner, mention is made elsewhere of St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Hilary, St. Basil, St. Cyprian, St. Hierome, St. Martin, Origen, Prosper, Ecumenius, Photius, Bernardus, Anselm, Didymus, Theophylactus, Tertullian, Athanasius, Lactantius, Cyrillus, Epiphanius, Gregory, Irenæus, Clemens, Rabanus, Isidorus, Eusebius, Justinus Martyr, Optatus, Eusebius Emissenus, and Bede.

2. "Infants, being baptized, and dying in their infancy, are by this Sacrifice washed from their sins . . . and they, which in act or deed do sin after this baptism, when they turn to God unfeignedly, they are *likewise* washed by this Sacrifice," &c.—1 B. iii. 1. *init.*

3. "Our office is, not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly, after that we are *baptized or justified*," &c.—1 B. iii. 3.

4. "By holy promises, we be made lively members of CHRIST, receiving the sacrament of Baptism. By like holy promises *the sacrament of Matrimony* knitteth man and wife in perpetual love."—1 B. vii. 1.

5. "Let us learn also here [in the Book of Wisdom] by *the infallible and undeceivable Word of God*, that," &c.—1 B. x. 1.

6. "The due receiving of His blessed Body and Blood, *under the form of bread and wine*."—*Note at end of B. i.*

7. "In the Primitive Church, *which was most holy and godly* . . . open offenders were not suffered once to enter into the house of the LORD . . . until they had done open penance . . . but this was practised, not only upon mean persons, but also upon the *rich, noble, and mighty persons*, yea, upon Theodosius, *that puissant and mighty Emperor*, whom . . . St. Ambrose . . . did . . . excommunicate."—2 B. i. 2.

8. "Open offenders were not . . . admitted to common prayer, and the use of the holy *sacraments*."—*Ibid.*

9. "Let us amend this our negligence and contempt in coming to the house of the LORD; and resorting thither diligently together, let us there . . . celebrating also reverently the LORD's holy *sacraments*, serve the LORD in His holy house."—*Ibid.* 5.

10. "Contrary to the . . . most manifest doctrine of the Scriptures, and contrary to the usage of the Primitive Church, *which was most pure and uncorrupt*, and contrary to the sentences and judgments of the *most ancient, learned, and godly* doctors of the Church."—2 B. ii. 1. *init.*

11. "This truth . . . was believed and taught by the *old holy fathers*, and *most ancient learned doctors*, and received by the old Primitive Church, *which was most uncorrupt and pure*."—2 B. ii. 2. *init.*

12. "Athanasius, a very ancient, holy, and learned bishop and doctor."—*Ibid.*

13. "Cyrillus, an old and holy doctor."—*Ibid.*

14. "Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamine, in Cyprus, a very holy and learned man."—*Ibid.*

15. "To whose (Epiphanius's) judgment you have . . . all the learned and godly bishops and clerks, yea, and the whole Church of that age," [the Nicene] "and so upward to our SAVIOUR CHRIST's time, by the space of about four hundred years, consenting and agreeing."—*Ibid.*

16. "Epiphanius, a bishop and doctor of such antiquity, holiness, and authority."—*Ibid.*

17. "St. Augustine, the best learned of all ancient doctors."—*Ibid.*

18. "That ye may know why and when, and by whom images were first used privately, and afterwards not only received into Christian churches and temples, but, in conclusion, worshipped also; and how the same was gainsaid, resisted, and forbidden, as well by *godly bishops and learned doctors*, as also by sundry Christian princes, I will briefly collect," &c. [The bishops and doctors which follow are:] "St. Jerome, Serenus, Gregory, the Fathers of the Council of Eliberis."

19. "Constantine, Bishop of Rome, assembled a Council of

bishops of the West, and did condemn Philippicus, *the Emperor*, and John, Bishop of Constantinople, of the *heresy of the Monothelites*, not without a cause indeed, but *very justly*."—*Ibid.*

20. "Those six Councils, *which were allowed and received of all men*."—*Ibid.*

21. "There were no images publicly by the space of almost *seven hundred years*. And there is *no doubt* but the Primitive Church, next the Apostles' times, was *most pure*."—*Ibid.*

22. "Let us beseech God that we, being *warned* by His holy Word . . . and by *the writings of old godly doctors* and ecclesiastical histories," &c.—*Ibid.*

23. "It shall be declared, both by God's Word, and the *sentences* of the ancient doctors, and *judgment* of the Primitive Church," &c.—2 B. ii. 3.

24. "Saints, whose souls *reign* in joy with God."—*Ibid.*

25. "That the law of God is likewise to be *understood* against all our images . . . appeareth further by the *judgment* of the old doctors and the Primitive Church."—*Ibid.*

26. "The Primitive Church, *which is specially to be followed*, as most incorrupt and pure."—*Ibid.*

27. "Thus it is declared by God's Word, the *sentences* of the doctors, and the *judgment* of the Primitive Church."—*Ibid.*

28. "The rude people, who specially as the *Scripture* teacheth, are in danger of superstition and idolatry; viz. Wisdom xiii. xiv."—*Ibid.*

29. "They [the 'learned and holy bishops and doctors of the Church' of the eight first centuries] were the preaching bishops . . . And as they were most zealous and diligent, so were they of excellent learning and godliness of life, and by both of great authority and credit with the people."—*Ibid.*

30. "The most virtuous and best learned, the most diligent also, and in number almost infinite, ancient fathers, bishops, and doctors . . . could do nothing against images and idolatry."—*Ibid.*

31. "As the *Word of God* testifieth, Wisdom xiv."—*Ibid.*

32. "The saints, *now reigning in heaven* with God."—*Ibid.*

33. "The *fountain of our regeneration* is there [in God's house] presented unto us."—2 B. iii.

36. "Somewhat shall now be spoken of one particular *good work*, whose commendation is both in the law and in the Gospel [fasting]."—2 B. iv. 1.

37. "If any man shall say . . . we are not now under the yoke of the law, we are set at liberty by the freedom of the Gospel; therefore these rites and customs of the old law bind not us, except it can be showed by the Scriptures of the New Testament, or by examples out of the same, that fasting, now under the Gospel, is a *restraint of meat, drink, and all bodily food and pleasures from the body*, as before: first, that we ought to fast, is a *truth more manifest, then it should here need to be proved* . . . Fasting, even by CHRIST's assent, is a withholding meat, drink, and all natural food from the body, &c."—*Ibid.*

38. "That it [fasting] was used in the Primitive Church, appeareth most evidently by the Chalcedon council, one of the *four first general councils*. The fathers assembled there . . . decreed in that council that every person, as well in his private as public fast, should continue all the day without meat and drink, till after the evening prayer. . . . This Canon teacheth how fasting was used in the *Primitive Church*."—*Ibid.* [The Council was A.D. 452.]

39. "Fasting then, by the *decree* of those 630 fathers, *grounding* their determinations in this matter upon the sacred Scriptures . . . is a withholding of meat, drink, and all natural food from the body, for the determined time of fasting."—*Ibid.*

40. "The order or decree made by the elders for washing oft-times, tending to superstition, our SAVIOUR CHRIST altered and changed the same in His Church, into a profitable sacrament, the sacrament of our *regeneration* or *new birth*."—2 B. iv. 2.

41. "Fasting thus used with prayer is of *great efficacy* and *weigheth much* with God, so the angel Raphael told Tobias."—*Ibid.*

42. "As he" [St. Augustine] "witnesseth in another place, the martyrs and holy men in times past, were wont after their

death to be *remembered* and *named* of the priest at divine service; but never to be invoked or called upon."—2 B. vii. 2.

43. "Thus you see that the *authority both* of Scripture and *also* of Augustine, doth not permit that we should pray to them."—*Ibid.*

44. "To temples have the *Christians* customably used to resort from time to time as to most meet places, where they might . . . receive His holy *sacraments* ministered unto them duly and purely."—2 B. viii. 1.

45. "The which thing both *CHRIST* and His apostles, *with all the rest of the holy fathers*, do sufficiently declare so."—*Ibid.*

46. "Our godly *predecessors*, and the *ancient* fathers of the Primitive Church, spared not their goods to build churches."—*Ibid.*

47. "If we will show ourselves true Christians, if we will be followers of *CHRIST* our *MASTER*, and of those *godly fathers* that have lived before us, and now have received the reward of true and faithful Christians," &c.—*Ibid.*

48. "We must . . . come unto the material churches and temples to pray . . . whereby we may reconcile ourselves to God, be partakers of His holy *sacraments*, and be devout hearers of His holy Word," &c.—*Ibid.*

49. "It [ordination] lacks the promise of remission of sin, as all *other* sacraments besides the two above named do. Therefore neither it, nor any *other* sacrament else, be *such* sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are."—2 Hom. ix.

50. "Thus we are taught, both by the Scriptures and ancient doctors, that," &c.—*Ibid.*

51. "The holy apostles and disciples of *CHRIST* . . . the godly fathers also, that were both *before* and *since* *CHRIST*, *endued without doubt with the HOLY GHOST*, . . . they both do most earnestly exhort us, &c. . . . that we should remember the poor . . . St. Paul crieth unto us after this sort . . . Isaiah the Prophet teacheth us on this wise . . . *And the holy father Tobit* giveth this counsel. *And the learned and godly doctor Chrysostom* giveth this admonition. . . . But what mean these often admoni-

tions and earnest exhortations of the prophets, apostles, fathers, and holy doctors?"—2 B. xi. 1.

52. "The holy fathers, Job and Tobit."—*Ibid.*

53. "CHRIST, whose especial *favour* we may be assured by *this means to obtain*," [viz. by almsgiving]—2 B. xi. 2.

54. "Now will I . . . show unto you how *profitable* it is for us to exercise them [alms-deeds] . . . [CHRIST's saying] *serveth to . . . prick us forwards . . . to learn . . . how we may recover our health, if it be lost or impaired, and how it may be defended and maintained if we have it. Yea, He teacheth us also therefore to esteem that as a precious medicine and an inestimable jewel, that hath such strength and virtue in it, that can either procure or preserve so incomparable a treasure.*"—*Ibid.*

55. "Then He and His disciples were grievously accused of the Pharisees, . . . because they went to meat and washed not their hands before, . . . CHRIST, answering their *superstitious* complaint, teacheth them an especial *remedy* how to *keep clean* their souls, . . . Give alms," &c.—*Ibid.*

56. "Merciful alms-dealing is *profitable* to *purge* the soul from the *infection and filthy spots of sin.*"—*Ibid.*

57. "The same lesson *doth the HOLY GHOST teach* in sundry places of the *Scripture*, saying, 'Mercifulness and alms-giving,' &c. [Tobit iv.] . . . The wise preacher, the son of Sirach, confirmeth the same, when he says, that 'as water quencheth burning fire,' " &c.—*Ibid.*

58. "A great *confidence* may they have *before the high God*, that show mercy and compassion to them that are afflicted."—*Ibid.*

59. "If ye have by any infirmity or weakness been touched and annoyed with them . . . straightway shall mercifulness *wipe and wash them away, as salves and remedies* to heal their sores and *grievous diseases.*"—*Ibid.*

60. "And therefore that *holy father* Cyprian admonisheth to consider how *wholesome* and *profitable* it is to relieve the needy, &c. . . . by the *which* we may *purge our sins* and *heal our wounded souls.*"—*Ibid.*

61. "We be therefore *washed* in our baptism from the *filthiness*

of sin, that we should live afterwards in the pureness of life."—
2 B. xiii. 1.

62. "By these means [by love, compassion, &c.] shall we move God to be *merciful to our sins*."—*Ibid*.

63. "'He was dead,' saith St. Paul, 'for our sins, and rose again for our *justification*' . . . He died to destroy the rule of the devil in us, and He rose again to send down His HOLY SPIRIT to rule in our hearts, to endue us with *perfect righteousness*.'"—2 B. xiv.

64. "The *ancient Catholic fathers*," [in marg.] Irenæus, Ignatius, Dionysius, Origen, Optatus, Cyprian, Athanasius, . . . "were not afraid to call this supper, some of them, *the salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death*; other, the sweet dainties of our SAVIOUR, the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection; other, the *food of immortality*, the healthful grace, and the conservatory to everlasting life."—2 B. xv. 1.

65. "The meat we seek in this supper is spiritual food, the nourishment of our soul, a heavenly refection, and not earthly; an *invisible meat*, and not bodily; a *ghostly substance*, and not carnal."—*Ibid*.

66. "Take this lesson . . . of Emissenus, a godly father that . . . thou *look up* with faith upon the *holy body and blood of thy God*, thou marvel with reverence, thou *touch* it with thy mind, thou receive it with the hand of thy heart, and thou take it fully with thy inward man."—*Ibid*.

67. "The saying of the holy martyr of God, St. Cyprian."—2 B. xx. 3.

Thus we see the authority of the Fathers, of the six first councils, and of the judgments of the Church generally, the holiness of the Primitive Church, the inspiration of the Apocrypha, the sacramental character of Marriage and other ordinances, the Real Presence in the Eucharist, the Church's power of excommunicating kings, the profitableness of fasting, the propitiatory virtue of good works, the Eucharistic commemoration, and justification by a righteousness [within us,]¹ are taught

¹ "By inherent righteousness," *First Edition*.

in the Homilies. Let it be said again, it is not here asserted that a subscription to all and every of these quotations is involved in the subscription of an Article which does but generally approve the Homilies ; but they who insist so strongly on our Church's holding that the Bishop of Rome is Antichrist because the Homilies declare it, should recollect that there are other doctrines contained in them beside it, which they should be understood to hold, before their argument has the force of consistency.

§ 12.—*The Bishop of Rome.*

Article xxxviii.—“ The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.”

By “ hath ” is meant “ ought to have,” as the Article in the 36th Canon and the Oath of Supremacy show, in which the same doctrine is drawn out more at length. “ No foreign prince, person, *prelate*, state, or potentate, hath, or *ought to have*, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm.”

This is the profession which every one must in consistency make, who does not join the Roman Church. If the Bishop of Rome has jurisdiction and authority here, why do we not acknowledge it, and submit to him ? To say then the above words, is nothing more or less than to say “ I am not a Roman Catholic ; ” and whatever reasons there are against saying them, are so far reasons against remaining in the English Church. They are a mere enunciation of the principle of Anglicanism.

Anglicans maintain that the supremacy of the Pope is not directly from revelation, but an event in Providence. All things may be undone by the agents and causes by which they are done. What revelation gives, revelation takes away ; what Providence gives, Providence takes away. God ordained by miracle, He reversed by miracle, the Jewish election ; He promoted in the way of Providence, and He cast down by the same way, the Roman empire. “ The powers that be, are ordained of God,” *while* they be, and have a claim on our obedience. When they cease to be, they cease to have a claim. They cease to be, when God removes them. He may be considered to remove them when He undoes what He had done. The Jewish election did not cease to be, when the Jews went into captivity : this was an event in Providence ; and what miracle had ordained, it was miracle that annulled. But the Roman power ceased to be when the barbarians overthrew it ; for it rose by the sword, and it therefore perished by the sword. The Gospel Ministry began in

CHRIST and His Apostles ; and what they began, they only can end. The Papacy began in the exertions and passions of man ; and what man can make, man can destroy. Its jurisdiction, while it lasted, was "ordained of God;" when it ceased to be, it ceased to claim our obedience ; and it ceased to be at the Reformation. The Reformers, who could not destroy a Ministry, which the Apostles began, could destroy a Dominion which the Popes founded.

Perhaps the following passage will throw additional light upon this point :—

"The Anglican view of the Church has ever been this: that its portions need not otherwise have been united together for their essential completeness, than as being descended from one original. They are like a number of colonies sent out from a mother-country. . . . Each Church is independent of all the rest, and is to act on the principle of what may be called Episcopal independence, except, indeed, so far as the civil power unites any number of them together. . . . Each diocese is a perfect independent Church, sufficient for itself; and the communion of Christians one with another, and the unity of them altogether, lie, not in a mutual understanding, intercourse, and combination, not in what they do in common, but in what they are and have in common, in their possession of the Succession, their Episcopal form, their Apostolical faith, and the use of the Sacraments. . . . Mutual intercourse is but an *accident* of the Church, not of its essence. . . . Intercommunion is a duty, as other duties, but is not the tenure or instrument of the communion between the unseen world and this; and much more the confederacy of sees and churches, the metropolitan, patriarchal, and papal systems, are matters of expedience or of natural duty from long custom, or of propriety from gratitude and reverence, or of necessity from voluntary oaths and engagements, or of ecclesiastical force from the canons of Councils, but not necessary in order to the conveyance of grace, or for fulfilment of the ceremonial law, as it may be called, of unity. Bishop is superior to bishop only in rank, not in real power; and the Bishop of Rome, the head of the Catholic world, is not the centre of unity, except as having a

primacy of order. Accordingly, even granting for argument's sake, that the English Church violated a duty in the 16th century, in releasing itself from the Roman supremacy, still it did not thereby commit that special sin, which cuts off from it the fountains of grace, and is called schism. It was essentially complete without Rome, and naturally independent of it ; it had, in the course of years, whether by usurpation or not, come under the supremacy of Rome ; and now, whether by rebellion or not, it is free from it : and as it did not enter into the Church invisible by joining Rome, so it was not cast out of it by breaking from Rome. These were accidents in its history, involving, indeed, sin in individuals, but not affecting the Church as a Church.

“Accordingly, the Oath of Supremacy declares ‘that no foreign prelate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, pre-eminence, or authority within this realm.’ In other words, there is nothing in the Apostolic system which gives an authority to the Pope over the Church, such as it does not give to a Bishop. It is altogether an ecclesiastical arrangement ; not a point *de fide*, but of expedience, custom, or piety, which cannot be claimed as if the Pope *ought* to have it, any more than, on the other hand, the King could of Divine right claim the supremacy ; the claim of both one and the other resting, not on duty or revelation, but on specific engagement. We find ourselves, as a Church, under the King now, and we obey him ; we were under the Pope formerly, and we obeyed him. ‘Ought’ does not, in any degree, come into the question.”

Conclusion.

One remark may be made in conclusion. It may be objected that the tenor of the above explanations is anti-Protestant, whereas it is notorious that the Articles were drawn up by Protestants, and intended for the establishment of Protestantism; accordingly, that it is an evasion of their meaning to give them any other than a Protestant drift, possible as it may be to do so grammatically, or in each separate part.

But the answer is simple:

1. In the first place, it is a *duty* which we owe both to the Catholic Church and to our own, to take our reformed confessions in the most Catholic sense they will admit; we have no duties toward their framers. [Nor do we receive the articles from their original framers, but from several successive convocations after their time; in the last instance, from that of 1662.]

2. In giving the Articles a Catholic interpretation, we bring them into harmony with the Book of Common Prayer, an object of the most serious moment in those who have given their assent to both formularies.

3. Whatever be the authority of the [Declaration] prefixed to the Articles, so far as it has any weight at all, it sanctions the mode of interpreting them above given. For its injoining the "literal and grammatical sense," relieves us from the necessity of making the known opinions of their framers, a comment upon their text; and its forbidding any person to "affix any *new* sense to any Article," was promulgated at a time when the leading men of our Church were especially noted for those Catholic views which have been here advocated.

4. It may be remarked, moreover, that such an interpretation is in accordance with the well-known general leaning of Melancthon, from whose writings our Articles are principally drawn, and whose Catholic tendencies gained for him that same reproach of popery, which has ever been so freely bestowed upon members of our own reformed Church.

"Melancthon was of opinion," says Mosheim, "that, for the sake of peace and concord many things might be given up and tolerated in the Church of Rome, which Luther considered could by no means be endured. . . . In the class of matters indifferent, this great man and his associates placed many things which had appeared of the highest importance to Luther, and could not of consequence be considered as indifferent by his true disciples. For he regarded as such, the doctrine of justification by faith alone, the necessity of good works to eternal salvation ; the number of the sacraments ; the jurisdiction claimed by the Pope and the Bishops ; extreme unction ; the observation of certain religious festivals, and several superstitious rites and ceremonies."—*Cent. XVI.* § 3. part 2. 27, 28,

5. Further : the Articles are evidently framed on the principle of leaving open large questions, on which the controversy hinges. They state broadly extreme truths, and are silent about their adjustment. For instance, they say that all necessary faith must be proved from Scripture, but do not say *who* is to prove it. They say that the Church has authority in controversies, they do not say *what* authority. They say that it may enforce nothing beyond Scripture, but do not say *where* the remedy lies when it does. They say that works *before* grace and justification are worthless and worse, and that works *after* grace and justification are acceptable, but they do not speak at all of works *with* God's aid, *before* justification. They say that men are lawfully called and sent to minister and preach, who are chosen and called by men who have public authority *given* them in the congregation to call and send ; but they do not add *by whom* the authority is to be given. They say that councils called *by princes* may err ; they do not determine whether councils called *in the name of CHRIST* will err.

[6. The variety of doctrinal views contained in the Homilies, as above shown, views which cannot be brought under Protestantism itself, in its greatest comprehension of opinions, is an additional proof, considering the connexion of the Articles with the Homilies, that the Articles are not framed on the principle of excluding those who prefer the theology of the early ages to that of the Reformation ; or rather let it be considered whether, considering both Homilies and Articles appeal to the Fathers and Catholic antiquity, in interpreting them by these, we are not

going to the very authority to which they profess to submit themselves.

7. Lastly, their framers constructed them in such a way as best to comprehend those who did not go so far in Protestantism as themselves. Anglo-Catholics then are but the successors and representatives of those moderate reformers; and their case has been directly anticipated in the wording of the Articles. It follows that they are not perverting, they are using them, for an express purpose for which among others their authors framed them. The interpretation they take was intended to be admissible; though not that which their authors took themselves. Had it not been provided for, possibly the Articles never would have been accepted by our Church at all. If, then, their framers have gained their side of the compact in effecting the reception of the Articles, let Catholics have theirs too in retaining their own Catholic interpretation of them.

An illustration of this occurs in the history of the 28th Article. In the beginning of Elizabeth's reign a paragraph formed part of it, much like that which is now appended to the Communion Service, but in which the Real Presence was *denied in words*. It was adopted by the clergy at the first convocation, but not published. Burnet observes on it thus :—

“ When these Articles were at first prepared by the convocation in Queen Elizabeth's reign, this paragraph was made a part of them; for the original subscription by both houses of convocation, yet extant, shews this. But the *design of the government* was at that time much turned to the *drawing over the body of the nation to the Reformation*, in whom the old leaven had gone deep; and no part of it deeper than the belief of the corporeal presence of CHRIST in the Sacrament; therefore it was *thought not expedient to offend* them by so particular a definition in this matter; in which the very word Real Presence was rejected. It might, perhaps, be also suggested, that here a definition was made that went too much upon the principles of natural philosophy; which how true soever, they might not be the proper subject of an article of religion. Therefore it was thought fit to suppress this paragraph; though it was a part of the Article that was subscribed, yet it was not published, but the paragraph that follows, ‘The Body of CHRIST,’ &c., was put in its stead, and was received and published by the next convocation; which upon the matter was a full explanation of the way of CHRIST's presence in this Sacrament; that ‘He is present in a heavenly and spiritual manner, and that faith is the mean by

which He is received.' This seemed to be more theological; and it does indeed amount to the same thing. But howsoever we see what was the sense of the first convocation in Queen Elizabeth's reign; it differed in nothing from that in King Edward's time: and therefore though this paragraph is now no part of our Articles, yet we are certain that the clergy at that time did not at all doubt of the truth of it; we are sure it was their opinion; since they subscribed it, though *they did not think fit* to publish it at first; and though it was afterwards changed for another, that was the same in sense."—*Burnet on Article XXVIII.*, p. 416.

What has lately taken place in the political world will afford an illustration in point. A French minister, desirous of war, nevertheless, as a matter of policy, draws up his state papers in such moderate language, that his successor, who is for peace, can act up to them, without compromising his own principles. The world, observing this, has considered it a circumstance for congratulation; as if the former minister, who acted a double part, had been caught in his own snare. It is neither decorous, nor necessary, nor altogether fair, to urge the parallel rigidly; but it will explain what it is here meant to convey. The Protestant Confession was drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics; and Catholics now will not be excluded. What was an economy in the reformers, is a protection to us. What would have been a perplexity to us then, is a perplexity to Protestants now. We could not then have found fault with their words; they cannot now repudiate our meaning.

[J. H. N.]

OXFORD.

The Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul.

1841.

SECOND EDITION.

These Tracts are continued in Numbers, and sold at the price of 2d. for each sheet, or 7s. for 50 copies.

LONDON: PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1841.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

The following works, all in single volumes, or pamphlets, and recently published, will be found more or less to uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in these Tracts:—

- Bp. Taylor on Repentance, by Hale.—*Rivingtons*.
 Bp. Taylor's Golden Grove.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, with translation.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Pusey on Cathedrals and Clerical Education.—*Roake and Varty*.
 Hook's University Sermons.—*Talboys, Oxford*.
 Pusey on Baptism (*published separately*).—*Rivingtons*.
 Newman's Sermons, 5 vols.—*Rivingtons*.
 Newman on Romanism, &c.—*Rivingtons*.
 The Christian Year.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Lyra Apostolica.—*Rivingtons*.
 Perceval on the Roman Schism.—*Leslie*.
 Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions.—*Duncan*.
 Dodsworth's Lectures on the Church.—*Burns*.
 Cary on the Apostolical Succession.—*Rivingtons*.
 Newman on Suffragan Bishops.—*Rivingtons*.
 Keble's Sermon on National Apostasy.—*Rivingtons*.
 Keble's Sermon on Tradition.—*Rivingtons*.
 Memoir of Ambrose Bonwick.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer.—*Rivingtons*.
 Law's first and second Letters to Hoadley.—*Rivingtons*.
 Bp. Andrews' Devotions. Latin and Greek.—*Pickering*.
 Hook's Family Prayers.—*Rivingtons*.
 Herbert's Poems and Country Pastor.
 Evans's Scripture Biography.—*Rivingtons*.
 Le Bas' Life of Archbishop Laud.—*Rivingtons*.
 Jones (of Nayland) on the Church.
 Bp. Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration.—*Rivingtons*.
 Bp. Beveridge's Sermons on the Ministry and Ordinances.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Bp. Jolly on the Eucharist.
 Fulford's Sermons on the Ministry, &c.—*Rivingtons*.
 Rose's Sermons on the Ministry.—*Rivingtons*.
 A Catechism on the Church.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Russell's Judgment of the Anglican Church.—*Baily*.
 Poole's Sermons on the Creed.—*Grant, Edinburgh*.
 Sutton on the Eucharist.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Leslie on the Regale and Pontificate.—*Leslie*.
 Pusey's Sermon on November 5.—*Rivingtons*.
 Bishop Wilson's Sacra Privata.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 The Cathedral, a Poem.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Palmer's Ecclesiastical History.—*Burns*.

Larger Works which may be profitably studied.

- Bishop Bull's Sermons.—*Parker, Oxford*.
 Bishop Bull's Works.—*University Press*.
 Waterland's Works.—*Do*.
 Wall on Infant Baptism.—*Do*.
 Pearson on the Creed.—*Do*.
 Leslie's Works.—*Do*.
 Bingham's Works.—*Straker, London*.
 Palmer on the Liturgy.—*University Press*.
 Palmer on the Church.—*Rivingtons*.
 Hooker, ed. Keble.—*University Press*.

A LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD

RICHARD,

LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD,

ON OCCASION OF No. 90,

IN THE SERIES CALLED

THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

BY J. H. NEWMAN, B. D.

VICAR OF ST. MARY THE VIRGIN'S, OXFORD.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER :

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

MDCCCXLI.

OXFORD: PRINTED BY L. SHRIMPTON.

A L E T T E R,

&c.

MY DEAR LORD,

It may seem strange that, on receipt of a message from your Lordship, I should proceed at once, instead of silently obeying it, to put on paper some remarks of my own on the subject of it; yet, as you kindly permit me to take such a course, with the expectation that I may thereby succeed in explaining to yourself and others my own feelings and intentions in the occurrence which has given rise to your Lordship's interference, I trust to your Lordship's indulgence to pardon me any discursiveness in my style of writing, or appearance of familiarity, or prominent introduction of myself, which may be incidental to the attempt.

Your Lordship's message is as follows: That your Lordship considers that the Tract No. 90. in the Series called the Tracts for the Times, is "objectionable, and may tend to disturb the peace and tranquillity of the Church," and that it is your Lordship's "advice that the Tracts for the Times should be discontinued."

Your Lordship has, I trust, long known quite enough of my feelings towards any such expression of your Lordship's wishes, to be sure I should at

once obey it, though it were ever so painful to me, or contrary to the course I should have taken if left to myself. And I do most readily and cheerfully obey you in this instance; and at the same time express my great sorrow that any writing of mine should be judged objectionable by your Lordship, and of a disturbing tendency, and my hope that in what I write in future I shall be more successful in approving myself to your Lordship.

I have reminded your Lordship of my willingness on a former occasion to submit myself to any wishes of your Lordship, had you thought it advisable at that time to signify them. In your Lordship's Charge in 1838, an allusion was made to the Tracts for the Times. Some opponents of the Tracts said that your Lordship treated them with undue indulgence. I will not imply that your Lordship can act otherwise than indulgently to any one, but certainly I did feel at the time, that in the midst of the kindness you shewed to me personally, you were exercising an anxious vigilance over my publication, which reminded me of my responsibility to your Lordship. I wrote to the Archdeacon on the subject, submitting the Tracts entirely to your Lordship's disposal. What I thought about your Charge will appear from the words I then used to him. I said, "A Bishop's lightest word *ex Cathedrâ*, is heavy. His judgment on a book cannot be light. It is a rare occurrence." And I offered to withdraw any of the Tracts over which I had control, if I were informed which were those to which your Lordship had objections. I afterwards wrote to your Lordship to this effect: that

“I trusted I might say sincerely, that I should feel a more lively pleasure in knowing that I was submitting myself to your Lordship’s expressed judgment in a matter of that kind, than I could have even in the widest circulation of the volumes in question.” Your Lordship did not think it necessary to proceed to such a measure, but I felt, and always have felt, that, if ever you determined on it, I was bound to obey.

Accordingly on the late occasion, directly I heard that you had expressed an unfavourable opinion of Tract 90, I again placed myself at your disposal, and now readily submit to the course on which your Lordship has finally decided in consequence of it. I am quite sure that in so doing I am not only fulfilling a duty I owe to your Lordship, but consulting for the well-being of the Church, and benefiting myself.

And now, in proceeding to make some explanations in addition, which your Lordship desires of me, I hope I shall not say a word which will seem like introducing discussion before your Lordship. It would ill become me to be stating private views of my own, and defending them, on an occasion like this. If I allude to what has been maintained in the Tracts, it will not be at all by way of maintaining it in these pages, but in illustration of the impressions and the drift with which they have been written. I need scarcely say they are thought by many to betray a leaning towards Roman Catholic error, and a deficient appreciation of our own truth; and your Lordship wishes me to shew that

these apprehensions have no foundation in fact. This I propose to do, and that by extracts from what I have before now written on the subject, which, while they can be open to no suspicion of having been provided to serve an occasion, will, by being now cited, be made a second time my own.

2. First, however, I hope to be allowed to make one or two remarks by way of explaining some peculiarities in the Tracts which at first sight might appear, if not to tend toward Romanism, at least to alienate their readers from that favoured communion in which God's good providence has placed us.

I know it is a prevalent idea, and entertained by persons of such consideration that it cannot be lightly treated, that many of the Tracts are the writing of persons who either are ignorant of what goes on in the world, and are gratifying their love of antiquarian research or of intellectual exercise at any risk; or, who are culpably reckless of consequences, or even find a satisfaction in the sensation or disturbance which may result from such novelties or paradoxes as they may find themselves in a condition to put forward. It is thought, that the writers in question often have had no aim at all in what they have hazarded, that they did not mean what they said, that they did not know the strength of their own words, and that they were putting forth the first crude notions which came into their minds; or that they were pursuing principles to their consequences as a sort of pastime, and developing their own theories in grave practical mat-

ters, in which no one should move without a deep sense of responsibility. In fact, that whatever incidental or intrinsic excellence there may be in the Tracts, and whatever direct or indirect benefits have attended them, there is much in them which is nothing more or less than mischievous, and convicts its authors of a wanton inconsiderateness towards the feelings of others.

I am very far from saying that there is any one evil temper or motive which may not have its share in any thing that I write myself; and it does not become me to deny the charge as far as it is brought against me, though I am not conscious of its justice. But still I would direct attention to this circumstance, that what persons who are not in the position of the writers of the Tracts set down to wantonness, may have its definite objects, though those objects be not manifest to those who are in other positions. I am neither maintaining that those objects are real, or important, or defensible, or pursued wisely or seasonably; but if they exist in the mind of the writers, I trust they will serve so far as to relieve them from the odious charge of scattering firebrands about without caring for or apprehending consequences.

May I then, without (as I have said) at all assuming the soundness of the doctrines to be mentioned, or by mentioning them seeking indirectly a sanction for them from your Lordship, be allowed to allude to one or two Tracts, merely in illustration of what I have said?

One of the latest Tracts is written upon "The

Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church." It discusses the subject of the mystical interpretation of nature and Scripture with a learning and seriousness which no one will wish to deny; but the question arises, and has actually been asked, why discuss it at all? why startle and unsettle the Christian of this age by modes of thought which are now unusual and strange; and which being thus fixed upon the Fathers, serve but to burden with an additional unpopularity an authority which the Church of England has ever revered, ever used in due measure to support her own claims upon the attachment of her children? But the state of the case has been this. For some years the argument in favour of our Church drawn from Antiquity has been met by the assertion, that that same Antiquity held also other opinions which no one now would think of maintaining; that if it were mistaken in one set of opinions, it might be in the other; that its mistakes were of a nature which argued feebleness of intellect, or unsoundness of judgment, or want of logical acumen in those who held them, which would avail against its authority in the instance in which it was used, as well as in that in which it was passed over. Moreover it was said that those who used it in defence of the Church knew this well, but were not honest enough to confess it. They were challenged to confess or deny the charges thus brought against the Fathers; and, since to deny the fact was supposed impossible, they were bid to draw out a case, such, as either to admit of a defence of the fact on grounds of reason,

or of its surrender without surrendering the authority of the Fathers altogether.

Such challenges, and they have not been unfrequent, afford, I conceive, a sufficient reason for any one who considers that the Church of England derives essential assistance from Christian antiquity in her interpretation of Scripture, to enter upon the examination of the particular objections by which certain authors have assailed its authority. Yet it is plain that by those who had not heard of their writings, such an examination would be considered a wanton moot of points which no one had called in question.

Again, much animadversion has been expressed, and in quarters which claim the highest deference, upon the Tract upon "Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge." Yet I do not think it will be called a wanton exercise of ingenuity. Not only does it bear marks, which no reader can mistake, of deep earnestness, but it in fact originated in a conviction in the mind of the writer of certain actual evils at present resulting from the defective appreciation with which the mass of even religious men regard the mysteries and privileges of the Gospel.

And another Tract, which has experienced a great deal of censure, is that which is made up of Selections from the Roman Breviary. I will not here take upon me to say a word in its defence, except to rescue its author from the charge of wantonness. He had observed what a very powerful source of attraction the Church of Rome possessed in her devotional Services, and he wished, judiciously or

not, to remove it by claiming it for ourselves. He was desirous of shewing, that such Devotions would be but a continuation in private of those public Services which we use in Church ; and that they might be used by individuals with a sort of fitness, (removing such portions as were against the Anglican creed or practice,) *because* they were a continuation. He said, in the opening of the Tract,

“It will be attempted to wrest a weapon out of our adversaries’ hands ; who have in this, as in many other instances, appropriated to themselves a treasure which was ours as much as theirs. . . . It may suggest . . . character and matter for our private devotions, over and above what our Reformers have thought fit to adopt into our public Services ; a use of it which will be but carrying out and completing what they have begun.” *Tract 75.*

I repeat it, that I have no intention here of defending the proceeding except from the charge of wantonness ; and with that view I would add, that though there is a difference not to be mistaken between a book published by authority and an anonymous Tract, yet, as far as its object is concerned, it is not very unlike the publication of Bishop Cosin’s Hours of Prayer, of which I hope I may be permitted to remind your Lordship in the words of the recent Editor.

“At the first coming of the Queen Henrietta into England, she and her French ladies, it appears, were equally surprised and dissatisfied at the disregard of the hours of Prayer, and the want of Breviaries. Their remarks, and perhaps the strength of their arguments, and the beauty of many of their books, induced the Protestant ladies of the house-

hold, to apply to King Charles. The King consulted Bishop White as to the best plan of supplying them with Forms of Prayer, collected out of already approved Forms. The Bishop assured him of the ease and the great necessity of such a work, and chose Cosin as the fittest person to frame the Manual. He at once undertook it, and in three months finished it and brought it to the King. The Bishop of London (Mountain), who was commanded to read it over and make his report, is said to have liked it so well, that instead of employing a Chaplain as was usual, he gave it an "*imprimatur*" under his own hand. There were at first only two hundred copies printed. There was, as Evelyn tells us, nothing of Cosin's own composure, nor any name set as author to it, but those necessary prefaces, &c., touching the times and seasons of Prayer, all the rest being entirely translated and collected out of an Office published by authority of Queen Elizabeth and out of our own Liturgy. 'This,' adds Evelyn, 'I rather mention to justify that industrious and pious Dean, who had exceedingly suffered by it, as if he had done it of his own head to introduce Popery, from which no man was more averse, and who was one who, in this time of temptation and apostasy, held and confirmed many to our Church.'

"The book soon grew into esteem, and justified the judgment which had been passed upon it, so that many who were at first startled at the title, 'found in the body of it so much piety, such regular forms of divine worship, such necessary consolations in special exigencies, that they reserved it by them as a jewel of great price and value.' 'Not one book,' it was said, 'was in more esteem with the Church of England, next to the Office of the Liturgy itself.' It appears, in fact, to have become exceedingly popular, and ran through ten editions, the last of which was published in 1719." *Preface to Cosin's Devotions*, p. xi.—xiii.

3. There has been another, and more serious pecu-

liarity in the line of discussion adopted in the Tracts, which, whatever its merits or demerits, has led to their being charged, I earnestly hope groundlessly, with wanton innovation on things established. I mean the circumstance that they have attempted to defend our Ecclesiastical system upon almost first principles. The *immediate* argument for acquiescing in what is established is that it *is* established : but when what has been established is in course of alteration, (and this evil was partly realized, and feared still more, eight years since,) the argument ceases, and then one is driven to considerations which are less safe because less investigated, which it is impossible at once to survey in all their bearings, or to have confidence in, that they will not do a disservice to the cause we are defending as well as a benefit. It seemed safe at the period in question, when the immediate and usual arguments failed, to recur to those which were used by our divines in the seventeenth century, and by the most esteemed in the century which followed, and down to this day. But every existing establishment, whatever be its nature, is a *fact*, a thing *sui simile*, which cannot be resolved into any one principle, nor can be defended and built up upon one idea. Its position is the result of a long history, which has moulded it, and stationed it, in the form and place which characterize it. It has grown into what it is by the influence of a number of concurrent causes in time past, and in consequence no one first principle can be urged in its defence, but what in some other respect or measure may also possibly be urged against it. This applies, I conceive, as to

all social institutions, so to the case of our religious establishment and system at this day. It is a matter of extreme difficulty and delicacy, to say the least, so to defend them in an argumentative discussion in one respect as not to tend to unsettle them in another. And all but minds of the greatest powers, or even genius, will find nothing left to them, if they do attempt it, but to strike a balance between gain and loss, and to attempt to do the most good on the whole.

I hope I shall not be misunderstood as if, in thus speaking, I meant to justify to your Lordship the consequences which have followed under these circumstances from the attempts of the Tracts for the Times in defence of the Church. I am but shewing that, even though evil has resulted, it need not have been wanton evil. Nor am I at all insinuating, that our established system is necessarily in fault, because it was exposed to this inconvenience; rather, as I have said, the cause lies in the nature of things, abstract principles being no sufficient measure of matters of fact. There cannot be a clearer proof of this than will be found in a reference to that antagonist system, which it has been the object of the Tracts in so great a measure to oppose. I do not put the case of Rome and her defenders as parallel to that between the Tracts and our own Church, of course; it would be postposterous to do so; but it may avail as an *à fortiori* argument, considering how systematic and complete the Roman system is, and what transcendent ability is universally allowed to Bossuet. Yet even Bossuet,

so great a controversialist, could not defend Romanism, so perfect a system, without doing a harm while he did a service. At least we may fairly conclude, that what the authorities of the Church of Rome thought to be a disservice to it, really was so at the time, though in the event it might prove a benefit. Dr. Maclaine in a note on his translation of Mosheim, observes of Bossuet's Exposition: "It is remarkable that nine years passed before this book could obtain the Pope's approbation. Clement X. refused it positively. Nay, several Roman Catholic Priests were rigorously treated and severely persecuted for preaching the doctrine contained in the Exposition of Bossuet, which was moreover formally condemned by the University of Louvain in the year 1685, and declared to be scandalous and pernicious. The Sorbonne also disavowed the doctrine contained in that book." (Vol. v. p. 126.)

I am not presuming to draw an illustration from the history of Bossuet, except as regards his intention and its result. No one can accuse him of wantonness. What happened to him in spite of great abilities, may happen to others in defect of them.

Several obvious illustrations may be given from the controversies to which the Tracts for the Times have given rise. Much attention, for instance, has of late years been paid by learned men to the question of the origin of our public Services. The Tracts have made use of the results of their investigations with a view of exalting our ideas of the

sacredness of our Eucharistical Rite; but in proportion as they have discerned what may be truly called an awful light resting on its component parts, they have discovered also that those parts have experienced some change in their disposition and circumstances by the hand of time; and accordingly, the higher appreciation the Tracts tend to create of the substance of the Service in the minds of their readers, the greater regret do they incidentally infuse, were they ever so unwilling to do so, that any external causes should have interfered with the shape in which we at this day receive it. The effect then has been to raise our reverence towards the whole indefinitely, yet to fling around that reverence somewhat of a melancholy feeling. I am not defending either process or result, but shewing how good and evil have gone together.

Again, as regards the doctrine of Purgatory, that the present Roman doctrine was not Catholically received in the first ages, is as clear as any fact of history. But there is an argument which Roman controversialists use in its favour, founded on a fact of very early antiquity, the practice of praying for the faithful departed. To meet this objection, the Tracts gave a reprint of Archbishop Ussher's chapter on the subject in his Answer to a Jesuit, in which he shews that the objects of those prayers were very different from those which the Roman doctrine of Purgatory requires. Thus the argument in question is effectually overthrown, but at the expense of incidentally bringing to light a primitive practice confessedly uncongenial to our present views of reli-

gion. In other words, if the Churchman is by the result of the discussion confirmed against Romanism, he has been incidentally, and for the moment, (I cannot deny it,) unsettled in some of his existing opinions.

Or again, the charge brought against the defenders of Baptismal Regeneration has commonly been, that such a doctrine explained away regeneration, and made a mere name and a shadow of that gift of which Scripture speaks so awfully. We answer, "So far from it, every one is in a worse condition for being regenerate, if he is not in a better. If he resist the grace he has received, it is a burden to him, not a blessing. He cannot take it for granted, that all is right with his soul, and think no more about it; for the gift involves responsibilities as well as privileges." And thus, while engaged in maintaining the truth, that all Christians are in a state of grace, we incidentally elicit the further truth, that sin after Baptism is a heavier matter than sin before it; or, in maintaining the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, we introduce the doctrine of repentance. We fortify our brethren in one direction; and may be charged with unsettling them in another.

Or again, in defending such doctrines and practices of the Church as Infant Baptism or the Episcopal Succession, the Tracts have argued that they rested on substantially the same basis as the Canon of Scripture, viz. the testimony of ancient Christendom. But to those who think this basis weak, the argument becomes a disparagement of the Canon, not a recommendation of the Creed.

My Lord, I have not said a word to imply that this disturbing and unsettling process is indissolubly connected with argumentative efforts in defence of our own system. I only say, that the good *naturally* runs into the evil; and so, without entering into the question whether or how they might have been kept apart in the Tracts, I am accounting for what looks like wantonness, yet I trust is not.

And perhaps I may be permitted to add, that our difficulties are much increased in a place like this, where there are a number of persons of practised intellects, who with or without unfriendly motives are ever drawing out the ultimate conclusions in which our principles result, and forcing us to affirm or deny what we would fain not consider or not pronounce upon. I am not complaining of this as unfair to us at all, but am shewing that we may have said extreme things, yet not from any wanton disregard of the feelings and opinions of others. The appeal is made to reason, and reason has its own laws, and does not depend on our will to take the more or less; and this is not less the case as regards the result, even though it be false reason which we follow, and our conclusions be wrong from our failing to detect the counteracting considerations which would avert the principles we hold from the direction in which we pursue them. And a conscientious feeling sometimes operates to keep men from concealing a conclusion which they think they see involved in their principles, and which others see not; and moreover a dread of appearing disingenuous

to others, who are directing their minds to the same subjects.

An instance has occurred in point quite lately as regards a subject introduced into Tract 90, which I am very glad to have an opportunity of mentioning to your Lordship. I have said in the Postscript of a Letter which I have lately addressed to Dr. Jelf, that the "vagueness and deficiency" of some parts of the Tract, in the conclusions drawn from the premises stated, arose in great measure from the author's being "more bent on laying down his principle than defining its results." In truth I was very unwilling to commit the view of the Articles which I was taking, to any precise statement of the ultimate approaches towards the Roman system allowed by our own. To say *how far* a person may go, is almost to tempt him to go up to the boundary line. I am far from denying that an evil arose from the vagueness which ensued, but it arose mainly from this feeling. Accordingly I left, for instance, the portion which treated of the Invocation of Saints without any definite conclusion at all, after bringing together various passages in illustration. However, friends and opponents discovered that my premises required, what I was very unwilling to state categorically, for various reasons, that the *ora pro nobis* was not on my shewing necessarily included in the invocation of Saints which the Article condemns. And in my Letter to Dr. Jelf, I have been obliged to declare this, under a representation that to pass it over would be considered disingenuous. I avail myself, however, of

the opportunity which this Letter to your Lordship affords me, without any suggestion as your Lordship knows, from yourself, or from any one else, to state as plainly as I can, lest my brethren should mistake me, my great apprehension concerning the use even of such modified invocations. Every feeling which interferes with God's sovereignty in our hearts, is of an idolatrous nature; and, as men are tempted to idolize their rank and substance, or their talent, or their children, or themselves, so may they easily be led to substitute the thought of Saints and Angels for the one supreme idea of their Creator and Redeemer, which should fill them. It is nothing to the purpose to urge the example of such men as St. Bernard in defence of such invocations. The holier the man, the less likely are they to be injurious to him; but it is another matter entirely when ordinary persons do the same. There is much less of awe and severity in the devotion which rests upon created excellence as its object, and worldly minds will gladly have recourse to it, to be saved the necessity of lifting up their eyes to their Sanctifier and Judge. And the multitude of men are incapable of many ideas; one is enough for them, and if the image of a Saint is admitted into their heart, he occupies it, and there is no room for Almighty God. And moreover there is the additional danger of *presumptuousness* in addressing Saints and Angels; by which I mean cases when men do so from a sort of curiosity, as the heathen might feel towards strange and exciting rites of worship, not with a clear conscience and spontane-

ously, but rather with certain doubts and misgivings about its propriety, and a secret feeling that it does not become them, and a certain forcing of themselves in consequence.

4. Unless your Lordship had ordered me to speak my mind on these subjects, I should feel that in these reflections I was adopting a tone very unlike that which becomes a private Clergyman addressing his Diocesan; but, encouraged by the notion that I am obeying your wishes, I will proceed in what I feel it very strange to allow myself in, though I do so. And, since I have been naturally led into the subject of Romanism, I will continue it, and explain the misapprehension which has been entertained of my views concerning it.

I do not wonder that persons who happen to fall upon certain writings of mine, and are unacquainted with others, and, as is natural, do not understand the sense in which I use certain words and phrases, should think that I explain away the differences between the Roman system and our own, which I hope I do not. They find in what I have written, no abuse, at least I trust not, of the individual Roman Catholic, nor of the Church of Rome, viewed abstractedly as a Church. I cannot speak against the Church of Rome, viewed in her formal character, as a true Church, since she is "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Corner-stone." Nor can I speak against her private members, numbers of whom, I trust, are God's people, in the way to Heaven, and one with us in heart, though not in profession. But what

I have spoken, and do strongly speak against is, that energetic system and engrossing influence in the Church *by which* it acts towards us, and meets our eyes, like a cloud filling it, to the eclipse of all that is holy, whether in its ordinances or its members. This system I have called in what I have written, Romanism or Popery, and by Romanists or Papists I mean all its members, so far as they are under the power of these principles; and while, and so far as this system exists, and it does exist now as fully as heretofore, I say that we can have no peace with that Church, however we may secretly love its particular members. I cannot speak against its private members; I should be doing violence to every feeling of my nature if I did, and your Lordship would not require it of me. I wish from my heart we and they were one; but we cannot, without a sin, sacrifice truth to peace; and, in the words of Archbishop Laud, "till Rome be other than it is" we must be estranged from her.

This view which, not inconsistently, I hope, with our chief divines, I would maintain against the Roman errors, seems to me to allow at once of zeal for the truth, and charity towards individuals and towards the Church of Rome herself. It presents her under a twofold aspect, and while recognizing her as an appointment of God on the one hand, it leads us practically to shun her, as beset with heinous and dangerous influences on the other. It is drawn out in the following extracts, under which I have thought it best to set it before your Lordship, rather than in statements made for the occasion, for the

reason I have given above. I think they will serve to shew, consistently with those which I made in my Letter to Dr. Jelf, both the real and practical stand I would make against Romanism, yet the natural opening there is for an unfounded suspicion that I feel more favourably towards it than I do.

“Our controversy with Romanists,” I say, “turns more upon facts than upon first principles; with Protestant sectaries it is more about principles than about facts. This general contrast between the two religions, which I would not seem to extend beyond what the sober truth warrants, for the sake of an antithesis, is paralleled in the common remark of our most learned controversialists, that Romanism *holds the foundation, or is the truth overlaid with corruptions*. This is saying the same thing in other words. They discern in it the great outlines of primitive Christianity, but they find them touched, if nothing worse, touched and tainted by error, and so made dangerous to the multitude,—dangerous except to men of spiritual minds, who can undo the evil, arresting the tendencies of the system by their own purity, and restoring it to the sweetness and freshness of its original state. The very force of the word *corruption*, implies that this is the peculiarity of Romanism. All error indeed of whatever kind, may be called a corruption of truth; still we properly apply the term to such kinds of error as are not denials but perversions, distortions, or excesses of it. Such is the relation of Romanism towards true Catholicity. . . .

“The same view of Romanism is implied, when we call our ecclesiastical changes in the sixteenth century a Reformation. A building has not been reformed or repaired, when it has been pulled down and built up again; but the word is used when it has been left substantially what it was before, only amended or restored in detail. In like manner we Anglo-Catholics do not profess a different religion from

the Romanists, we profess their Faith *all but* their corruptions.

“Again, this same character of Romanism as a perversion, not a contradiction of Christian Truth, is confessed as often as members of our Church in controversy with it contend, as they may rightly do, that it must be judged, not by the formal decrees of the Council of Trent, as its advocates are fond of doing, but by its practical working and its existing state in the countries which profess it. Romanists would fain confine us in controversy to the consideration of the bare and acknowledged principles of their Church; we consider this to be an unfair restriction; why? because we conceive that Romanism is far more faulty in its details than in its formal principles, and that Councils, to which its adherents would send us, have more to do with its abstract system than with its practical working; that the abstract system contains, for the most part, *tendencies* to evil, which the actual working brings out, thus supplying illustrations of that evil which is really though latently contained in principles capable in themselves of an honest interpretation. Thus for instance, the decree concerning Purgatory might be charitably made almost to conform to the doctrine of St. Austin, or St. Chrysostom, were it not for the comment on it afforded by the popular belief as existing in those countries which hold it, and by the opinions of the Roman schools.” *On Romanism*, p. 50—54.

Again,

“I have been speaking of Romanism, not as an existing political sect among us, but considered in itself, in its abstract system, and in a state of quiescence. Viewed indeed in action, and as realized in its present partisans, it is but one out of the many denominations which are the disgrace of our age and country. In temper and conduct it does but resemble that unruly Protestantism which lies on our other side, and it submits without reluctance to be

allied and to act with it towards the overthrow of a purer religion The reproach of the present Romanists, is that they are inconsistent ; and it is a reproach which is popularly felt to be just. They are confessedly unlike the loyal men who rallied round the throne of our first Charles, or who fought, however ill-advisedly, for his exiled descendants I have here considered Romanism in its abstract professions for two reasons. First, I would willingly believe, that in spite of the violence and rancour of its public supporters, there are many individuals in its communion of gentle, affectionate, and deeply religious minds ; and such a belief is justified when we find that the *necessary* difference between us and them is not one of essential principle, that it is the difference of superstition, and not of unbelief, from religion. Next, I have insisted upon it, by way of shewing what must be the nature of their Reformation, if in God's merciful counsels a Reformation awaits them. It will be far more a reform of their popular usages and opinions, and Ecclesiastical policy, or a destruction of what is commonly called Popery, than of their abstract principles and maxims." *On Romanism*, p. 56, 57.

And again,

"They profess to appeal to primitive Christianity; we honestly take their ground, as holding it ourselves; but when the controversy grows animated, and descends into details, they suddenly leave it, and desire to finish the dispute on some other field. In like manner in their teaching and acting, they begin as if in the name of all the Fathers at once, but will be found in the sequel to prove, instruct, and enjoin, simply in their own name. Our differences from them, considered not in theory but in fact, are in no sense matters of detail and questions of degree. In truth, there is a tenet in their theology which assumes quite a new position in relation to the rest, when we pass from the abstract and quiescent theory to the practical workings of the

system. The infallibility of the existing Church is then found to be its first principle, whereas, before, it was a necessary, but a secondary doctrine. Whatever principles they profess in theory, resembling or coincident with our own, yet when they come to particulars, when they have to prove this or that article of their creed, they supersede the appeal to Scripture and Antiquity by the pretence of the infallibility of the Church, thus solving the whole question, by a summary and final interpretation both of Antiquity and of Scripture." *On Romanism*, p. 59, 60.

In the following passage the Anglican and Roman systems are contrasted with each other.

"Both we and Romanists hold that the Church Catholic is unerring in its declarations of Faith, or saving doctrine; but we differ from each other as to what is the faith, and what is the Church Catholic. They maintain that faith depends on the Church, we that the Church is built on the faith. By Church Catholic, we mean the Church Universal, as descended from the Apostles; they those branches of it which are in communion with Rome. They consider the see of St. Peter, to have a promise of permanence; we the Church Catholic and Apostolic. Again, they understand by the Faith, whatever the Church at any time declares to be faith; we what it has actually so declared from the beginning. We hold that the Church Catholic will never depart from those outlines of doctrine, which the Apostles formally published; they that she will never depart in any of her acts from that entire system, written and oral, public and private, explicit and implicit, which they received and taught; we that she has a gift of fidelity, they of discrimination.

"Again, both they and we anathematize those who deny the Faith; but they extend the condemnation to all who question any decree of the Roman Church; we apply it to those only who deny any article of the original Apostolic Creed. The creed of Romanism is ever subject to

increase; ours is fixed once for all. We confine our anathema to the Athanasian Creed; Romanists extend it to Pope Pius's. They cut themselves off from the rest of Christendom; we cut ourselves off from no branch, not even from themselves. We are at peace with Rome as regards the essentials of faith; but she tolerates us as little as any sect or heresy. We admit her Baptism and her Orders; her custom is" [conditionally] "to re-baptize and re-ordain our members who chance to join her." *On Romanism*, p. 259, 260.

And I shew, in one of the Tracts, the unfairness of detaching the Canons of Trent from the actual conduct of the Roman Church for any practical purposes, while things are as they are, as follows:—

"An equally important question remains to be discussed; viz. What the *sources* are, whence we are to gather our opinions of Popery. Here the Romanists complain of their opponents, that, instead of referring to the authoritative documents of their Church, Protestants avail themselves of any errors or excesses of individuals in it, as if the Church were responsible for acts and opinions which it does not enjoin. Thus the legends of relics, superstitions about images, the cruelty of particular Prelates or Kings, or the accidental fury of a populace, are unfairly imputed to the Church itself.... Accordingly they claim to be judged by their formal documents, especially by the decrees of the Council of Trent.

"Now here we shall find the truth to lie between the two contending parties. Candour will oblige us to grant that the mere acts of individuals should not be imputed to the body;...yet not so much as they themselves desire. For though the acts of individuals are not the acts of the Church, yet they may be the results, and therefore illustrations, of its principles. We cannot consent then to confine ourselves to a mere reference to the text of the Tridentine

decrees, as Romanists would have us, apart from the teaching of their Doctors, and the practice of the Church, which are surely the legitimate comment upon them. The case stands as follows. A certain system of teaching and practice has existed in the Churches of the Roman Communion for many centuries; this system was discriminated and fixed in all its outlines at the Council of Trent. It is therefore not unnatural, or rather it is the procedure we adopt in any historical research, to take the general opinions and conduct of the Church in elucidation of their Synodal decrees; just as we take the tradition of the Church Catholic and Apostolic as the legitimate interpreter of Scripture, or of the Apostles' Creed. On the other hand, it is as natural that these decrees, being necessarily concise and guarded, should be much less objectionable than the actual system they represent. It is not wonderful then, yet it is unreasonable, that Romanists should protest against our going beyond these decrees in adducing evidence of their Church's doctrine, on the ground that nothing more than an assent to them is requisite for communion with her: *e. g.* the Creed of Pope Pius, which is framed upon the Tridentine decrees, and is the Roman Creed of Communion, only says, 'I firmly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that souls therein detained are aided by the prayers of the faithful,' nothing being said of its being a place of punishment, nothing, or all but nothing, which does not admit of being explained of merely an intermediate state.

"Now supposing we found ourselves in the Roman Communion, of course it would be a great relief to find that we were not bound to believe more than this vague statement, nor should we (I conceive) on account of the received interpretation about Purgatory superadded to it, be obliged to leave our Church. But it is another matter entirely, whether we who are external to that Church, are not bound to consider it as one whole system, written and unwritten,

defined indeed and adjusted by general statements, but not limited to them or coincident with them.

“The conduct of the Catholics during the troubles of Arianism, affords us a parallel case and a direction in this question. The Arian Creeds were often quite unexceptionable, differing from the orthodox only in this, that they omitted the celebrated word *Homoïousion*, and in consequence did not obviate the possibility of that perverse explanation of them, which in fact their framers adopted. Why then did the Catholics refuse to subscribe them? Why did they rather submit to banishment from one end of the Roman world to the other? Why did they become Confessors and Martyrs? The answer is ready. They interpreted the language of the creeds by the professed opinions of their framers. They would not allow error to be introduced into the Church by an artifice. On the other hand, when at Ariminum they were seduced into a subscription of one of these creeds, though unobjectionable in its wording, their opponents instantly triumphed, and circulated the news that the Catholic world had come over to their opinion. It may be added that, in consequence, ever since that era, phrases have been banished from the language of theology which heretofore had been innocently used by orthodox teachers.

“Apply this to the case of Romanism. We are not indeed allowed to take at random the accidental doctrine or practice of this or that age, as an explanation of the decrees of the Latin Church; but when we see clearly that certain of these decrees have a natural tendency to produce certain evils, when we see those evils actually existing far and wide in that Church, in different nations and ages, existing especially where the system is allowed to act most freely, and only absent where external checks are present, sanctioned moreover by its celebrated teachers and expositors, and advocated by its controversialists with the tacit consent of the whole body, under such circumstances

surely it is not unfair to consider our case parallel to that of the Catholics during the ascendancy of Arianism. Surely it is not unfair in such a case to interpret the formal document of belief by the realized form of it in the Church, and to apprehend that, did we express our assent to the creed of Pope Pius, we should find ourselves bound hand and foot, as the Fathers at Ariminum, to the corruptions of those who profess it.

“To take the instances of the Adoration of Images and the Invocation of Saints. The Tridentine Decree declares that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke the Saints, and that the Images of Christ, and the Blessed Virgin, and the other Saints should ‘receive due honour and veneration;’ words, which themselves go to the very verge of what could be received by the cautious Christian, though possibly admitting of a honest interpretation. Now we know in matter of fact that in various parts of the Roman Church, a worship approaching to idolatrous is actually paid to Saints and Images, in countries very different from each other, as for instance, Italy and the Netherlands, and has been countenanced by eminent men and doctors, and that without any serious or successful protest from any quarter: further that, though there may be countries where no scandal of the kind exists, yet these are such as have, in their neighbourhood to Protestantism, a practical restraint upon the natural tendency of their system.

“Moreover, the silence which has been observed, age after age, by the Roman Church, as regards these excesses, is a point deserving of serious attention;—for two reasons: first, because of the very solemn warnings pronounced by our Lord and His Apostle, against those who introduce scandals into the Church, warnings which seem almost prophetic of such as exist in the Latin branches of it. Next it must be considered that the Roman Church has had the power to denounce and extirpate them. Not to mention its use of its Apostolical powers in other matters, it has had the civil

power at its command, as it has shewn in the case of errors which less called for its interference; all of which shews it has not felt sensitively on the subject of this particular evil." — *Tracts for the Times*, No. 71. p. 14—18.

And in the following passage, written in the course of last year, the contrariety between the Primitive and Roman systems is pointed out.

"Allowing the Church Catholic ever so much power over the faith, allowing that it may add what it will, so that it does not contradict what has been determined in former times, yet let us come to the plain question, Does the Church, according to Romanists, know more now than the Apostles knew? Their theory seems to be that the whole faith was present in the minds of the Apostles, nay, of all Saints at all times, but in great measure as a matter of mere temper, feeling, and unconscious opinion, or implicitly, not in the way of exact statements and in an intellectual form. All men certainly hold a number of truths and act on them, without knowing it; when a question is asked about them, then they are obliged to reflect what their opinion has ever been, and they bring before themselves and assent to doctrines which before were but latent within them. We have all heard of men changing to so-called Unitarianism, and confessing on a review of themselves that they had been Unitarians all along without knowing it, till some accident tore the bandage off their eyes. In like manner the Roman Catholics, we suppose, would maintain that the Apostles were implicit Tridentines; that the Church held in the first age what she holds now; only that heresy, by raising questions, has led to her throwing her faith into dogmatic shape, and has served to precipitate truths which before were held in solution. Now this is all very well in the abstract, but let us return to the point, as to what the Apostles held and did, and what they did not. Does the Romanist mean, for instance, to tell us that St. Paul the

Apostle, when he was in perils of robbers or perils by the sea, offered up his addresses to St. Mary, and vowed some memorial to her, if she would be pleased 'deprecari pro illo Filium Dei?' Does he mean to say that the same Apostle, during that period of his life when as yet he was not 'perfect' or had 'attained,' was accustomed to pray that the merits of St. John the Baptist should be imputed to him? Did he or did he not hold that St. Peter could give indulgences to shorten the prospective sufferings of the Corinthians in purgatory? We do not deny that St. Paul certainly does bring out his thoughts only in answer to express questions asked, and according to the occasion; that St. John has written a Gospel, as later, so also more dogmatic, than his fellow-Evangelists, in consequence of the rise of heresy. We do not at all mean to affirm, that the sacred writers said out at one time all they had to say. There are many things we can *imagine* them doing and holding, which yet, in matter of fact, we believe they did not do, or did not hold. We can *imagine* them administering extreme unction or wearing copes. Again, there are many things which they *could* neither hold nor do, merely from the circumstances of the times or the moment. They could not determine whether general councils might or might not be held without the consent of Princes, or determine the authority of the Vulgate before it was written, or enjoin infant baptism before Christians had children, or decide upon the value of heretical baptism before there were heretics, and before those heretics were baptized. But still there are limits to these concessions; we cannot imagine an Apostle saying and doing what Romanists say and do: can they imagine it themselves? Do they themselves, for instance, think that St. Paul was in the habit of saying what Bellarmine and others say,—*Laus Deo Virginiæ Matri*? Would they not pronounce a professed epistle of St. Paul's which contained these words spurious on this one ground?"

It is commonly urged by Romanists, that the Notes of their Church are sufficiently clear to enable the private Christian to dispense with argument in joining their Communion in preference to any other. Now in the following passage it is observed, that that Communion has Notes of error upon it, serving in practice quite as truly as a guide from it, as the Notes which it brings forward can be made to tell in its favour.

“Our Lord said of false prophets, ‘By their fruits shall ye know them;’ and, however the mind may be entangled theoretically, yet surely it will fall upon certain marks in Rome which seem intended to convey to the simple and honest enquirer a solemn warning to keep clear of her, while she carries them about her. Such are her denying the Cup to the laity, her idolatrous worship of the Blessed Virgin, her Image-worship, her recklessness in anathematizing, and her schismatical and overbearing spirit. Surely we have more reason for thinking that her doctrines concerning Images and the Saints are false, than that her saying they are Apostolical is true. I conceive, then, on the whole, that while Rome confirms by her accordant witness our own teaching in all greater things, she does not tend by her novelties, and violence, and threats, to disturb the practical certainty of Catholic doctrine, or to seduce from us any sober and conscientious enquirer.” *On Romanism*, p. 324, 325.

And in one of the Tracts for the Times, speaking of certain Invocations in the Breviary, I say,

“These portions of the Breviary carry with them their own plain condemnation, in the judgment of an English Christian; no commendation of the general structure and matter of the Breviary itself will have any tendency to reconcile him to them; and it has been the strong feeling

that this is really the case, that has led the writer of these pages fearlessly and securely to admit the real excellencies, and to dwell upon the antiquity of the Roman Ritual. He has felt that, since the Romanists required an unqualified assent to the *whole* of the Breviary, and that there were passages which no Anglican ever could admit, praise the true Catholic portion of it as much as he might, he did not in the slightest degree approximate to a recommendation of Romanism." *Tract 75. p. 9, 10.*

"They" [the Antiphons to the blessed Virgin] "shall be here given in order to shew clearly, as a simple inspection of them will suffice to do, the utter contrariety between the Roman system, as actually existing, and our own; which, however similar in certain respects, are in others so at variance, as to make any attempt to reconcile them together in their present state, perfectly nugatory. Till Rome moves towards us, it is quite impossible that we should move towards Rome; however closely we may approximate to her in particular doctrines, principles, or views." *Tract 75. p. 23.*

In the foregoing passages, protests will be found against the Roman worship of St. Mary, Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images, Purgatory, Denial of the Cup, Indulgences, and Infallibility; besides those which are entered against the fundamental theory out of which these errors arise.

5. And now having said, I trust, as much as your Lordship requires on the subject of Romanism, I will add a few words, to complete my explanation, in acknowledgment of the inestimable privilege I feel in being a member of that Church over which your Lordship, with others, presides. Indeed, did I not feel it to be a privilege which I am able to seek no

where else on earth, why should I be at this moment writing to your Lordship? What motive have I for an unreserved and joyful submission to your authority, but the feeling that the Church in which your Lordship rules is a divinely-ordained channel of supernatural grace to the souls of her members? Why should I not prefer my own opinion, and my own way of acting, to that of the Bishop's, except that I know full well that in matters indifferent I should be acting lightly towards the Spouse of Christ and the Awful Presence which dwells in her, if I hesitated a moment to put your Lordship's will before my own? I know full well that your Lordship's kindness to me personally, would be in itself quite enough to win any but the most insensible heart, and, did a clear matter of conscience occur in which I felt bound to act for myself, my feelings towards your Lordship would be a most severe trial to me, independently of the higher considerations to which I have alluded; but I trust I have shewn my dutifulness to you prior to the influence of personal motives; and this I have done because I think that to belong to the Catholic Church is the first of all privileges here below, as involving in it heavenly privileges, and because I consider the Church over which your Lordship presides to be the Catholic Church in this country. Surely then I have no need to profess in words, I will not say my attachment, but my deep reverence towards the Mother of Saints, when I am shewing it in action; yet that words may not be altogether wanting, I beg to lay before your Lordship the following extract from a

defence of the English Church, which I wrote against a Roman controversialist in the course of the last year.

“The Church is emphatically a living body, and there can be no greater proof of a particular communion being part of the Church, than the appearance in it of a continued and abiding energy, nor a more melancholy proof of its being a corpse than torpidity. We say an energy continued and abiding, for accident will cause the activity of a moment, and an external principle give the semblance of self-motion. On the other hand, even a living body may for a while be asleep. And here we have an illustration of what we just now urged about the varying cogency of the Notes of the Church according to times and circumstances. No one can deny that at times the Roman Church itself, restless as it is at most times, has been in a state of sleep or disease, so great as to resemble death; the words of Baronius, speaking of the tenth century, are well known: “*Dormiebat tunc plane alto, ut apparet, sopore Christus in navi, cum hisce flantibus validis ventis, navis ipsa fluctibus operiretur. Una illa reliqua consolatio piis, quia etsi Dominus dormivit, in eadem tamen navi dormivit.*” It concerns then those who deny that we are the true Church, because we have not at present this special Note, intercommunion with other Christians, to shew cause why the Roman Church in the tenth century should be so accounted, with profligates, or rather the profligate mothers of profligate sons, for her supreme rulers. And still notwithstanding life is a note of the Church; she alone revives, even if she declines; heretical and schismatical bodies cannot keep life; they gradually become cold, stiff, and insensible. They may do some energetic work at first from excitement or remaining warmth, as the Arians converted the Goths, though even this seems, as the history shews us, to have been an accident, for which they can claim

no praise ; or as the Nestorians spread in the East, from circumstances which need not here be noticed. But wait awhile, and 'see the end of these men.' 'I myself,' says the Psalmist, 'have seen the ungodly in great power, and flourishing like a green bay-tree. I went by, and lo, he was gone ; I sought him, but his place could no where be found.' Heresies and schisms, whatever be their promise at first, and whatever be their struggles, yet gradually and surely tend not to be. Utter dissolution is the scope to which their principles are directed from the first, and towards which for the most part they steadily and continually move. Or, if the principle of destruction in them, be not so living as to hurry them forward in their career, then they remain inert and motionless, where they first are found, kept together in one by external circumstances, and going to pieces as soon as air is let in upon them. Now if there ever were a Church on whom the experiment has been tried, whether it had life in it or not, the English is that one. For three centuries it has endured all vicissitudes of fortune. It has endured in trouble and prosperity, under seduction and under oppression. It has been practised upon by theorists, browbeaten by sophists, intimidated by princes, betrayed by false sons, laid waste by tyranny, corrupted by wealth, torn by schism, and persecuted by fanaticism. Revolutions have come upon it sharply and suddenly, to and fro, hot and cold, as if to try what it was made of. It has been a sort of battle-field on which opposite principles have been tried. No opinion, however extreme any way, but may be found, as the Romanists are not slow to reproach us, among its Bishops and Divines. Yet what has been its career upon the whole ? Which way has it been moving through three hundred years ? Where does it find itself at the end ? Lutherans have tended to Rationalism ; Calvinists have become Socinians ; but what has it become ? As far as its Formularies are concerned, it may be said all along to have

grown towards a more perfect Catholicism than that with which it started at the time of its estrangement; every act, every crisis, which marks its course, has been upward. It never was in so miserable case as in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. At the end of Elizabeth's there was a conspicuous revival of the true doctrine. Advancements were made in the Canons of 1603. How much was done under Charles the First, need not be said; and done permanently, so as to remain to this day in spite of the storm which immediately arose, sweeping off the chief agents in the work, and for a time levelling the Church to the ground. More was done than even yet appears, as a philosophical writer has lately remarked, in the Convocation of 1661. One juncture there was of a later date (1688) which seemed to threaten a relapse; yet it was the only crisis in which no Ecclesiastical act took place. The temper, however, of the Church, certainly did go back; a secular and semi-sceptical spirit came in. Now then was the time when the Church lay open to injury; yet, by a wonderful providence, the Convocation being, during this period, suspended, there was no means of making permanent impressions on its character; and thus civil tyranny was its protection against itself. That very Convocation too expired in an act of zeal and faith. In our own times, temporal defences have been removed which the most strenuous political partisans of the Church considered essential to its well-being, and the loss of which they deplored as the first steps towards its ruin. To their surprise these well-intentioned men have beheld what they thought a mere establishment, dependent on man to create and destroy, rise up and walk with a life of its own, such as it had before they and their constitution came into being. How many learned Divines have we had, even our enemies being judges! and in proportion as they were learned, so on the whole have they approximated towards the full ancient truth. Or take again those whom by a natural instinct 'all the people count as Prophets,' and will

it not be found that either altogether or in those works which are most popular, those writers are ruled by primitive and Catholic principles? No man, for instance, was an abler writer in the last century than Warburton, or more famous in his day; yet the glare is over, and now Bishops Wilson and Horne, men of far inferior powers, but of Catholic temper and principles, fill the doctor's Chair in the eyes of the many. What a note of the Church is the mere production of a man like Butler, a pregnant fact much to be meditated on! and how strange it is, if it be as it seems to be, that the real influence of his work is only just now beginning! and who can prophecy in what it will end? Thus our Divines grow with centuries, expanding after their death in the minds of their readers into more and more exact Catholicism as years roll on. Nay even our errors and heterodoxies turn to good. Wesleyanism in itself tends to heresy, if it was not heretical in the outset; but so far as it has been in the Church, it has been overruled to rouse and stimulate us, when we were asleep. Moreover look at the internal state of the Church at this moment; much that is melancholy is there, strife, division, error. But still on the whole, enlarge on the evils as you will, there is *life* there, perceptible, visible life; rude indeed, undisciplined, perhaps self-willed, but life; and not the life of death, not that heretical restlessness, which, as we have observed, only runs out the quicker for its activity, and hastens to be no more, but, we may humbly trust, a heavenly principle after all, which is struggling towards development, and gives presage of truth and holiness to come. Look across the Atlantic to the daughter Churches of England in the States; shall one that is barren bear a child in her old age? yet 'the barren hath borne seven.' Schismatic branches put out their leaves at once in an expiring effort; our Church has waited three centuries, and then blossoms, like Aaron's rod, budding and blooming and yielding fruit, while the rest are dry. And

lastly look at the present position of the Church at home; there too we shall find a Note of the true city of God, the Holy Jerusalem. She is in warfare with the world as the Church Militant should be; she is rebuking the world, she is hated, she is pillaged by the world. And as if it were providentially intended to shew this resemblance between her and the sister branches, what place she has here, that they have there; the same enemies encompassing both them and her, and the same trials and exploits lying in prospect. She has a common cause with them, as far as they are faithful, if not a common speech and language; and is together with them in warfare, if not in peace.

“Much might be said on this subject. At all times, since Christianity came into the world, an open contest has been going on between religion and irreligion; and the true Church, of course, has ever been on the religious side. This then is a sure test in every age, *where* the Christian should stand. . . . Now applying this simple criterion to the public parties of this day, it is very plain that the English Church is at present on God’s side, and therefore so far God’s Church;—we are sorry to be obliged to add that there is as little doubt on which side English Romanism is. It must be a very galling thought to serious minds who profess it, to feel that they are standing with the enemies of God, cooperating with the haters of truth and haters of the light, and thereby prejudicing religious minds even against those verities which Rome continues to hold.

“As for the English Church, surely she has Notes enough, ‘the signs of an Apostle in all patience, and signs and wonders and mighty deeds.’ She has the Note of possession, the Note of freedom from party-titles; the Note of life, a tough life and a vigorous; she has ancient descent, unbroken continuance, agreement in doctrine with the ancient Church. Those of Bellarmine’s Notes, which she certainly has not, are intercommunion with Christendom, the glory of miracles, and the prophetic

light, but the question is, whether she has not enough of divinity about her to satisfy her sister Churches on their own principles, that she is one body with them."

6. This may be sufficient to shew my feelings towards my Church, as far as statements on paper can shew them. I have already, however, referred to what is much more conclusive, a practical evidence of them; and I think I can shew your Lordship besides without difficulty that my present conduct is no solitary instance of such obedience, but that I have observed an habitual submission to things as they are, and have avoided in practice, as far as might be, any indulgence of private tastes and opinions, which left to myself perhaps I should have pursued.

And first, as regards my public teaching; though every one has his peculiarities, and I of course in the number, yet I do hope that it has not on the whole transgressed that liberty of opinion which is allowed on all hands to the Anglican Clergyman. Nay I might perhaps insist upon it, that in the general run of my Sermons, fainter and fewer traces will be found than might have been expected of those characteristics of doctrine, with which my name is commonly associated. I might without offence have introduced what is technically called High-Church doctrine in much greater fulness; since there are many who do not hold it to my own extent, or with my own eagerness, whose teaching is more prominently coloured by it. My Sermons have been far more practical than doctrinal; and this, from a dislike of introducing a character and tone of preaching very different from that which is

generally to be found. And I hope this circumstance may serve as my reply to an apprehension which has been felt, as if what I say in Tract 90 concerning a cast of opinions which is not irreconcilable with our Articles, involves an introduction of those opinions into the pulpit. Yet who will maintain, that what merely happens not to be forbidden or denied in the Articles, may at once be made the subject of teaching or observance? There is nothing concerning the Inspiration of Scripture in the Articles; yet would a Bishop allow a Clergyman openly to deny it in the pulpit? May the Scripture Miracles be explained away, because the Articles say nothing about them? Would your Lordship allow me to preach in favour of duelling, gaming, or simony? or to revile persons by name from the pulpit? or be grossly and violently political? Every one will surely appreciate the importance and sacredness of Pulpit instruction; and will allow, that though the holding certain opinions may be compatible with subscription to the Articles, the publishing and teaching them may be inconsistent with ecclesiastical station.

Those who frequent St. Mary's, know that the case is the same as regards the mode in which worship is conducted there. I have altered nothing I found established; when I have increased the number of the Services, and had to determine points connected with the manner of performing them for myself, if there was no danger of offending others, I have followed my own judgment, but not otherwise. I have left many things, which I

did not like, and which most other persons would have altered. And here, with your Lordship's leave, I will make allusion to one mistake concerning me which I believe has reached your Lordship's ears, and which I only care to explain to my Bishop. The explanation, I trust, will be an additional proof of my adherence to the principle of acquiescing in the state of things in which I find myself. It has been said, I believe, that in the Communion Service I am in the practice of mixing water with the wine, and that of course on a religious or ecclesiastical ground. This is not the case. We are in the custom at St. Mary's of celebrating the Holy Communion every Sunday, and most weeks early in the morning. When I began the early celebration, communicants represented to me that the wine was so strong as to distress them at that early hour. Accordingly I mixed it with water in the bottle. However, it became corrupt. On this I mixed it at the time. I speak honestly when I say that this has been my only motive. I have not mixed it when the Service has been in the middle of the day.

If I were not writing to my Bishop, I should feel much shame at writing so much about myself; but confession cannot be called egotism. Friend and stranger have from time to time asked for my cooperation in the attempt to gain additional power for the Church. I have been accustomed to answer that it was my duty to acquiesce in the state of things under which I found myself, and to serve God, if so be, in it. New precedents indeed, con-

firming or aggravating our present Ecclesiastical defects, I have ever desired to oppose; but as regards changes, persons to whom I defer very much, know that, rightly or wrongly, I have discountenanced, for instance, any movement tending to the repeal even of the Statutes of *Præmunire*, which has been frequently agitated, under the notion that such matters were not our business, and that we had better "remain in the calling wherein we were called." Of course I cannot be blind to the fact that "*time* is the great innovator;" and that the course of events may of itself put the Church in possession of greater liberty of action, as in time past it has abridged it. This would be the act of a higher power; and then I should think it a duty to act according to that new state in which the Church found itself. Knowledge and virtue certainly are power. When the Church's gifts were doubled, its influence would be multiplied a hundred fold; and influence tends to become constituted authority. This is the nature of things, which I do not attempt to oppose; but I have no wish at all to take part in any measures which aim at changes.

And in like manner I have set my face altogether against suggestions which zealous and warm-hearted persons sometimes have made of reviving the project of Archbishop Wake, for considering the differences between ourselves and the foreign Churches with a view to their adjustment. Our business is with ourselves—to make ourselves more holy, more self-denying, more primitive, more worthy our high calling. Let the Church of Rome

do the same, and it will come nearer to us, and will cease to be what we one and all mean, when we speak of Rome. To be anxious for a composition of differences, is to begin at the end. Did God visit us with large measures of His grace, and the Roman Catholics also, they would be drawn to us, and would acknowledge our Church as the Catholic Church in this country, and would give up whatever offended and grieved us in their doctrine and worship, and would unite themselves to us. This would be a true union; but political reconciliations are but outward and hollow, and fallacious. And till they renounce political efforts, and manifest in their public measures the light of holiness and truth, perpetual warfare is our only prospect. It was the prophetic announcement concerning the Elijah of the first Advent, that he should "turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers." This is the only change which promises good and is worth an effort.

What I have been saying as regards Roman Catholics, I trust I have kept steadily before me in ecclesiastical matters generally. While I have considered that we ought to be content with the outward circumstances in which Providence has placed us, I have tried to feel that the great business of one and all of us is, to endeavour to raise the moral tone of the Church. It is sanctity of heart and conduct which commends us to God. If we be holy, all will go well with us. External things are comparatively nothing; whatever be a

religious body's relations to the State—whatever its regimen—whatever its doctrines—whatever its worship—if it has but the life of holiness within it, this inward gift will, if I may so speak, take care of itself. It will turn all accidents into good, it will supply defects, and it will gain for itself from above what is wanting. I desire to look at this first, in all persons and all communities. Where Almighty God stirs the heart, there His other gifts follow in time; sanctity is the great Note of the Church. If the Established Church of Scotland has this Note, I will hope all good things of it; if the Roman Church in Ireland has it not, I can hope no good of it. And in like manner, in our own Church, I will unite with all persons as brethren, who have this Note, without any distinction of party. Persons who know me can testify that I have endeavoured to cooperate with those who did not agree with me, and that again and again I have been put aside by them, not put them aside. I have never concealed my own opinions, nor wished them to conceal theirs; but have found that I could bear them better than they me. And I have long insisted upon it, that the only way in which the members of our Church, so widely differing in opinion at this time, can be brought together in one, is by a “turning of heart” to one another. Argumentative efforts are most useful for this end under this sacred feeling; but till we try to love each other, and what is holy in each other, and wish to be all one, and mourn that we

are not so, and pray that we may be so, I do not see what good can come of argument.

7. Before concluding, there is one more subject on which I wish briefly to address your Lordship, though it is one which I have neither direct claim nor encouragement to introduce to your Lordship's notice. Yet our Colleges here being situated in your Lordship's diocese, it is natural for me to allude to the lately expressed opinion of the Heads of Houses upon the Tract which has given rise to this Letter. I shall only do so, however, for the purpose of assuring your Lordship of the great sorrow it gives me to have incurred their disapprobation, and of the anxiety I have felt for some time past from the apprehension that I was incurring it. I reverence their position in the country too highly to be indifferent to their good opinion. I never can be indifferent to the opinion of those who hold in their hands the education of the classes on which our national well-being, spiritual and temporal, depends; who preside over the foundations of "famous men" of old, whose "name liveth for evermore;" and from whom are from time to time selected the members of the sacred order to which your Lordship belongs. Considering my own peculiar position in the University, so much have these considerations pressed upon me for a long while, that, as various persons know, I seriously contemplated, some time since, the resignation of my Living, and was only kept from it by the advice of a friend to whom I felt I ought to submit myself. I say this, moreover, in explanation

of a Letter I lately addressed to the Vice-Chancellor, lest it should seem dictated either by a mere perception of what was becoming in my situation, or from some sudden softening of feeling under an unexpected event. It expressed my habitual deference to persons in station.

And now, my Lord, suffer me to thank your Lordship for your most abundant and extraordinary kindness towards me, in the midst of the exercise of your authority. I have nothing to be sorry for, except having made your Lordship anxious, and others whom I am bound to revere. I have nothing to be sorry for, but every thing to rejoice in and be thankful for. I have never taken pleasure in seeming to be able to move a party, and whatever influence I have had has been found not sought after. I have acted because others did not act, and have sacrificed a quiet which I prized. May God be with me in time to come, as He has been hitherto! and He will be, if I can but keep my hand clean and my heart pure. I think I can bear, or at least will try to bear, any personal humiliation, so that I am preserved from betraying sacred interests, which the Lord of grace and power has given into my charge.

I am, My dear Lord,

Your Lordship's faithful and affectionate Servant,

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

*Oriel College,
March 29th, 1841.*

OXFORD: PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

11

.

.

—

89079735338



B89079735338A